

EXHIBIT 174

Pachulski Stang Ziehl & Jones LLP

10100 Santa Monica Blvd.
13th Floor
Los Angeles, CA 90067

Board of Directors
Highland Capital Management LP
300 Crescent Court ste. 700
Dallas, TX 75201

May 31, 2021
Invoice 127958
Client 36027
Matter 00002
JNP

RE: Postpetition

STATEMENT OF PROFESSIONAL SERVICES RENDERED THROUGH 05/31/2021

██████████	████████████████████
██████████████████	██████████████████
██	████████████████████
██████████████████████████████████████	████████████████████
██████████████████████████████████████	████████████████████

D-CNL001107
Appx. 02767

D-CNL001108
Appx. 02768

D-CNL001110
Appx. 02770

Pachulski Stang Ziehl & Jones LLP
 Highland Capital Management LP
 36027 - 00002

Page: 16
 Invoice 127958
 May 31, 2021

				<u>Hours</u>	<u>Rate</u>	<u>Amount</u>
05/03/2021	GVD	BL	Revise and serve demand letter re Dugaboy note	0.30	950.00	\$285.00
05/03/2021	GVD	BL	Revise and serve demand letter re Hunter Mountain note	0.30	950.00	\$285.00
05/03/2021	GVD	BL	Conference with PSZJ team re response to withdrawal of reference in NPA notes litigation	0.40	950.00	\$380.00
05/03/2021	GVD	BL	Review and revise response to motion to enforce the reference in NPA notes litigation	1.20	950.00	\$1,140.00
05/03/2021	GVD	BL	Follow up conference with PSZJ re opposition to motion to withdraw the reference in NPA litigation	0.30	950.00	\$285.00
05/03/2021	GVD	BL	Conference with J. Morris re status of notes litigation	0.20	950.00	\$190.00
05/04/2021	IDK	BL	Review of J Kim's next version of opposition to NextPoint motion to withdraw reference (.3); E-mails with J Kim re my proposed changes to same, as well as comments/questions from J Pomerantz re same and J Kim response (.5); Review of final revised opposition to same and green light to file (.2).	1.00	1325.00	\$1,325.00
05/04/2021	JKK	BL	Emails Demo, Morris, Pomerantz on withdrawal reference pleadings issues; research/revise oppositions to reference withdrawal motions.	2.20	995.00	\$2,189.00

D-CNL001111

Appx. 02771

D-CNL001112
Appx. 02772

D-CNL001113
Appx. 02773

D-CNL001114
Appx. 02774

D-CNL001115
Appx. 02775

Pachulski Stang Ziehl & Jones LLP
 Highland Capital Management LP
 36027 - 00002

Page: 21
 Invoice 127958
 May 31, 2021

				<u>Hours</u>	<u>Rate</u>	<u>Amount</u>
05/05/2021	HRW	BL	Prepare interrogatory verification for R&Os to NPA interrogatories in notes litigation (0.2); Review Seery's comments to R&Os to NPA discovery demands in notes litigation (0.1); Review DSI documents for production for NPA discovery demands in notes litigation (0.2).	0.50	695.00	\$347.50
05/06/2021	IDK	BL	Review of updated opposition to Dondero motion to withdraw reference (.3); E-mails with J Kim re same and further issues on mandatory withdrawal of reference and related memo on same (.3); Telephone conference with J Pomerantz re same (.1); E-mails with J Kim re status and ok to file (.1).	0.80	1325.00	\$1,060.00
05/06/2021	IDK	BL	E-mails with J Kim re mistake made in filed opposition today to Dondero motion to withdraw ref, and how to fix, including feedback of J Pomerantz re same.	0.40	1325.00	\$530.00
05/06/2021	JJK	BL	Emails Kharasch on withdrawal reference objections, and revise same and prepare supplement for filing.	4.20	995.00	\$4,179.00

D-CNL001117
Appx. 02777

D-CNL001118
Appx. 02778

Pachulski Stang Ziehl & Jones LLP
 Highland Capital Management LP
 36027 -00002

Page: 26
 Invoice 127958
 May 31, 2021

				<u>Hours</u>	<u>Rate</u>	<u>Amount</u>
05/07/2021	HRW	BL	Review discovery requests in notes litigation (2.0); Edit R&O's for NPA discovery requests (0.3).	2.30	695.00	\$1,598.50
05/08/2021	RJF	BL	Review and revise motion to enforce.	0.80	1395.00	\$1,116.00
05/08/2021	JAM	BL	Review/revise document requests, interrogatories, and requests for admission relating to HCMS notes litigation (1.1); e-mails with J. Pomerantz, H. Winograd re: revisions to discovery requests for HCMS notes litigation (0.2).	1.30	1245.00	\$1,618.50

Pachulski Stang Ziehl & Jones LLP
 Highland Capital Management LP
 36027 -00002

Page: 27
 Invoice 127958
 May 31, 2021

				<u>Hours</u>	<u>Rate</u>	<u>Amount</u>
05/08/2021	HRW	BL	Draft discovery demands for notes litigation (3.5); Review discovery requests to Debtor in notes litigation (1.2).	4.70	695.00	\$3,266.50
05/09/2021	HRW	BL	Review discovery requests to Debtor in notes litigation (2.5); Prepare search terms for document production in notes litigation (1.0).	3.50	695.00	\$2,432.50
05/10/2021	RJF	BL	Begin work on motion to dismiss.	1.00	1395.00	\$1,395.00

D-CNL001121
Appx. 02781

D-CNL001122
Appx. 02782

D-CNL001123
Appx. 02783

Pachulski Stang Ziehl & Jones LLP
 Highland Capital Management LP
 36027 -00002

Page: 31
 Invoice 127958
 May 31, 2021

				<u>Hours</u>	<u>Rate</u>	<u>Amount</u>
[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
05/11/2021	GVD	BL	Conference with counsel to Hunter Mountain re note demand and follow up re same	0.30	950.00	\$285.00
[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
05/11/2021	HRW	BL	Draft search terms for document production for NPA notes litigation (1.3); Communicate with R. Half re: document production for NPA notes litigation (0.6).	1.90	695.00	\$1,320.50
[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]

D-CNL001125
Appx. 02785

D-CNL001126
Appx. 02786

D-CNL001127
Appx. 02787

D-CNL001128
Appx. 02788

D-CNL001129
Appx. 02789

Pachulski Stang Ziehl & Jones LLP
 Highland Capital Management LP
 36027 -00002

Page: 40
 Invoice 127958
 May 31, 2021

				<u>Hours</u>	<u>Rate</u>	<u>Amount</u>
05/17/2021	JAM	BL	Review/revise objection to Dondero motion to compel (2.0); e-mails with J. Pomerantz, G. Demo, H. Winograd, Z. Annable re: draft objection to Dondero motion to compel (0.2); draft JAM declaration in support of Debtor's objection to Dondero motion to compel (0.7); e-mails with G. Demo, H. Winograd, L. Canty, Z. Annable re: exhibits to JAM declaration (0.2).	3.10	1245.00	\$3,859.50
05/17/2021	LSC	BL	Conduct research in connection with motion to withdraw the reference for G. Demo.	0.60	460.00	\$276.00
05/17/2021	LSC	BL	Assist with preparation of exhibits in connection with Debtor's Objection to Motion to Compel Deposition Testimony of James P. Seery, Jr.	0.40	460.00	\$184.00
05/17/2021	GVD	BL	Review response to motion to compel	0.30	950.00	\$285.00
05/17/2021	GVD	BL	Prepare for argument on motions to withdraw the reference	0.80	950.00	\$760.00

Pachulski Stang Ziehl & Jones LLP
 Highland Capital Management LP
 36027 -00002

Page: 41
 Invoice 127958
 May 31, 2021

				<u>Hours</u>	<u>Rate</u>	<u>Amount</u>
			([REDACTED]			
			[REDACTED]			
			[REDACTED]			
			[REDACTED]			
			[REDACTED]			
05/17/2021	HRW	BL	Oversee discovery searches and production for NPA notes litigation (0.3); Review opposition to Dondero motion to compel in notes litigation (0.2).	0.50	695.00	\$347.50
05/ [REDACTED]			[REDACTED]			
			[REDACTED]			
			[REDACTED]			
			[REDACTED]			
			[REDACTED]			
			[REDACTED]			
			[REDACTED]			
			[REDACTED]			
			[REDACTED]			
			[REDACTED]			
			[REDACTED]			
			[REDACTED]			
			[REDACTED]			
			[REDACTED]			
			[REDACTED]			
			[REDACTED]			
			[REDACTED]			
05/18/2021	JNP	BL	Review motion to withdraw the reference in	0.40	1295.00	\$518.00

D-CNL001132
Appx. 02792

Pachulski Stang Ziehl & Jones LLP
 Highland Capital Management LP
 36027 -00002

Page: 43
 Invoice 127958
 May 31, 2021

				<u>Hours</u>	<u>Rate</u>	<u>Amount</u>
05/18/2021	GVD	BL	Prepare for argument re motion to withdraw the reference	4.90	950.00	\$4,655.00
05/18/2021	HRW	BL	Gather general discovery in notes litigations (0.5); Review discovery demands in notes litigation (0.3); Call with J. Morris re: general discovery for notes litigation (0.1); Call with J. Donahue re: general discovery for notes litigation (0.3).	1.20	695.00	\$834.00
05/19/2021	IDK	BL	Attend conference call with J Pomerantz, others on	1.20	1325.00	\$1,590.00

Pachulski Stang Ziehl & Jones LLP
 Highland Capital Management LP
 36027 -00002

Page: 44
 Invoice 127958
 May 31, 2021

				<u>Hours</u>	<u>Rate</u>	<u>Amount</u>
			presentation of opposition argument to motions to withdraw the reference (1.2)			
05/19/2021	JNP	BL	Participate on zoom hearing prep for motions to withdraw the reference with Gregory V. Demo, John A. Morris and Ira D. Kharasch.	1.20	1295.00	\$1,554.00

D-CNL001135
Appx. 02795

Pachulski Stang Ziehl & Jones LLP
 Highland Capital Management LP
 36027 - 00002

Page: 46
 Invoice 127958
 May 31, 2021

				<u>Hours</u>	<u>Rate</u>	<u>Amount</u>
05/19/2021	GVD	BL	Attend conference with PSZJ working team re preparation for argument on motion to withdraw reference	1.20	950.00	\$1,140.00
05/19/2021	GVD	BL	Prepare for argument on motion to withdraw the reference	3.10	950.00	\$2,945.00
05/19/2021	HRW	BL	Send amended discovery R&Os to opposing counsel for NPA requests in notes litigation (0.1); Call with J. Morris and C. Mackle re: document production to Dondero's first Set of requests in notes litigation (0.3); Send production to Dondero's counsel in response to first set of requests in notes litigation (0.1).	0.50	695.00	\$347.50
05/19/2021	HRW	BL	Prepare and review document production to Dondero's first Set of requests in notes litigation (2.2).	2.20	695.00	\$1,529.00

Pachulski Stang Ziehl & Jones LLP
 Highland Capital Management LP
 36027 - 00002

Page: 47
 Invoice 127958
 May 31, 2021

				<u>Hours</u>	<u>Rate</u>	<u>Amount</u>
05/20/2021	JNP	BL	Participate in hearing on motion to compel J. Seery testimony.	1.10	1295.00	\$1,424.50
05/20/2021	JNP	BL	Emails to and from J. Seery and Gregory V. Demo regarding Latham communications with DSI.	0.10	1295.00	\$129.50
05/20/2021	JNP	BL	Emails to and from John A. Morris regarding U. S. Trustee inquiry.	0.10	1295.00	\$129.50
05/20/2021	JAM	BL	Preparing for hearing on Dondero's motion to compel (0.3); court conference on Dondero's motion to compel (1.1).	1.40	1245.00	\$1,743.00
05/20/2021	GVD	BL	Attend hearing re motion to compel	1.10	950.00	\$1,045.00

Pachulski Stang Ziehl & Jones LLP
 Highland Capital Management LP
 36027 -00002

Page: 48
 Invoice 127958
 May 31, 2021

				<u>Hours</u>	<u>Rate</u>	<u>Amount</u>
05/20/2021	JE	BL	Work on reply brief (11.0); review motion to amend complaint (.4); call with Mr. Morris regarding briefing (.3); research judgment issues (1.4).	13.10	1195.00	\$15,654.50
05/21/2021	JMF	BL	Review replies re contempt and reference withdrawal motions.	0.40	1050.00	\$420.00
05/21/2021	JAM	BL	Finalize responses and objections to Dondero's second set of document requests (0.1); e-mail to Dondero's counsel re: R&Os to second set of document requests (0.1).	0.20	1245.00	\$249.00
05/21/2021	GVD	BL	Prepare witness and exhibit list re notes litigation	0.60	950.00	\$570.00

Pachulski Stang Ziehl & Jones LLP
 Highland Capital Management LP
 36027 - 00002

Page: 49
 Invoice 127958
 May 31, 2021

				<u>Hours</u>	<u>Rate</u>	<u>Amount</u>
05/22/2021	JNP	BL	Review motion to compel testimony of former employees.	0.20	1295.00	\$259.00
05/22/2021	GVD	BL	Conference with J. Morris, J. Seery, and HCMLP team re HCMFA affirmative defense	1.10	950.00	\$1,045.00
05/22/2021	GVD	BL	Review motions for leave to amend	0.20	950.00	\$190.00
05/22/2021	HRW	BL	Review HCMFA motion to amend answer (0.5).	0.50	695.00	\$347.50
05/23/2021	JNP	BL	Emails to and from D. Rukavina regarding Sauter subpoena in connection with reference motion.	0.20	1295.00	\$259.00

Pachulski Stang Ziehl & Jones LLP
 Highland Capital Management LP
 36027 - 00002

Page: 50
 Invoice 127958
 May 31, 2021

				<u>Hours</u>	<u>Rate</u>	<u>Amount</u>
05/23/2021	JAM	BL	Prepare Subpoena for DC Sauter (notes litigation) for hearing on motion to withdraw reference (0.3); e-mail to J. Seery, T. Surgent, D. Klos, J. Pomerantz, G. Demo, H. Winograd re: strategy, hearing on motion to withdraw reference (0.3); telephone conference with J. Seery, G. Demo re: prepare for deposition (Dondero notes litigation) (1.1); e-mail to H. Winograd, J. Pomerantz, I. Kharasch, G. Demo re: motion for summary judgment, opposition to motions to amend (0.7); communications with G. Demo re: potential exhibits for amended W&E list (0.2); e-mails with B. Levine re: Dondero summary judgment motion (0.1); telephone conference with H. Winograd re: Dondero summary judgment motion (0.1); telephone conference with G. Demo re: documents/exhibit list/facts re: motion to withdraw the reference (1.1); revise Sauter subpoena (0.1); e-mails with Z. Annable re: Sauter subpoena (0.3); amend Sauter subpoena (0.1); e-mails with D. Rukavina, J. Pomerantz re: Sauter subpoena (0.3).	4.70	1245.00	\$5,851.50
05/23/2021	LSC	BL	Preparation of amended exhibit lists (3) and exhibits for 5/25/21 hearing, including redactions to certain exhibits.	5.60	460.00	\$2,576.00
05/23/2021	GVD	BL	Conference with J. Morris re motion to withdraw reference	0.10	950.00	\$95.00
05/23/2021	GVD	BL	Conference with J. Seery and J. Morris re depo prep for notes litigation	1.20	950.00	\$1,140.00
05/23/2021	GVD	BL	Conference with J. Morris re evidentiary issues for motion to withdraw the reference	1.10	950.00	\$1,045.00
05/23/2021	GVD	BL	Prepare for hearing on motion to withdraw the reference	2.90	950.00	\$2,755.00

Pachulski Stang Ziehl & Jones LLP
 Highland Capital Management LP
 36027 -00002

Page: 51
 Invoice 127958
 May 31, 2021

				<u>Hours</u>	<u>Rate</u>	<u>Amount</u>
05/24/2021	IDK	BL	Attend conference call re notes collection issues (.3).	0.30	1325.00	\$397.50
05/24/2021	JNP	BL	Review and comment on Gregory V. Demo outline on motion to withdraw reference argument.	0.50	1295.00	\$647.50
05/24/2021	JNP	BL	Conference with Gregory V. Demo, Ira D. Kharasch and John A. Morris regarding hearing on motion to withdraw reference.	0.60	1295.00	\$777.00
05/24/2021	JNP	BL	Conference with PSZJ team regarding update on notes litigation.	0.30	1295.00	\$388.50
05/24/2021	JNP	BL	Conference with John A. Morris regarding proposal regarding depositions in notes litigation.	0.10	1295.00	\$129.50

Pachulski Stang Ziehl & Jones LLP
 Highland Capital Management LP
 36027 - 00002

Page: 52
 Invoice 127958
 May 31, 2021

				<u>Hours</u>	<u>Rate</u>	<u>Amount</u>
05/24/2021	RJF	BL	Internal call regarding notes litigation.	0.30	1395.00	\$418.50
05/24/2021	JMF	BL	Review litigation summary (.3); status call re same (.3).	0.60	1050.00	\$630.00
05/24/2021	JMF	BL	Status call re issues in notes payable litigation.	0.30	1050.00	\$315.00
05/24/2021	JMF	BL	Review motion to amend answer re notes litigation.	0.30	1050.00	\$315.00
05/24/2021	JAM	BL	Tel c. w/ J. Dubel re: motions to amend and withdraw the reference (0.4); prepare for Seery deposition (0.3); tel c. w/ G. Demo re: hearing on motion to withdraw the reference (0.2); tel c. w/ J. Seery re: deposition (0.1); review/revise exhibit list for hearing on motion to withdraw the reference (0.2); prepare for hearing on withdrawal of the reference (0.7); communications w/ J. Pomerantz, G. Demo re: debtor's schedules and Advisor's notes (0.2); Seery deposition (Dondero notes litigation) (2.7); tel c. w/ J. Seery, G. Demo re: deposition and hearing (0.4); tel c. w/ J. Pomerantz, I. Kharasch, G. Demo re: hearing on motion to withdraw the	7.00	1245.00	\$8,715.00

Pachulski Stang Ziehl & Jones LLP
 Highland Capital Management LP
 36027 -00002

Page: 53
 Invoice 127958
 May 31, 2021

				<u>Hours</u>	<u>Rate</u>	<u>Amount</u>
			reference (0.6); tel c. w/ J. Pomerantz re: hearing (0.2); tel c. w/ J. Pomerantz re: e-mails with D. Rukavina concerning motion to amend/motion to withdraw reference (0.1); e-mails w/ D. Rukavina, J. Pomerantz re: motion to amend/Sauter subpoena/motion to withdraw the reference (0.4); e-mail to J. Seery re: deposition transcript (0.1); e-mail to J. Seery, J. Pomerantz, G. Demo, H. Winograd re: Klos deposition (0.1); e-mails w/ M. Aigen, J. Seery, T. Surgent, D. Klos re: discovery in Dondero notes litigation (0.3)			
05/24/2021	GVD	BL	Prepare for hearing on motion to withdraw the reference	5.80	950.00	\$5,510.00
05/24/2021	GVD	BL	Attend deposition of J. Seery re Dondero note litigation	2.60	950.00	\$2,470.00
05/24/2021	GVD	BL	Conference with J. Seery and J. Morris re follow up to Seery deposition	0.30	950.00	\$285.00
05/24/2021	GVD	BL	Conference with PSZJ re status of note litigation and motion to withdraw the reference	0.60	950.00	\$570.00
05/24/2021	GVD	BL	Attend PSZJ status conference on notes litigation	0.30	950.00	\$285.00

Pachulski Stang Ziehl & Jones LLP
 Highland Capital Management LP
 36027 -00002

Page: 54
 Invoice 127958
 May 31, 2021

				<u>Hours</u>	<u>Rate</u>	<u>Amount</u>
05/25/2021	JNP	BL	Participate on hearing regarding motions to withdraw reference.	2.80	1295.00	\$3,626.00
05/25/2021	JNP	BL	Conference with J. Seery and John A. Morris after hearing on motion to withdraw reference.	0.40	1295.00	\$518.00
05/25/2021	JNP	BL	Emails regarding answer date and response.	0.10	1295.00	\$129.50

Pachulski Stang Ziehl & Jones LLP
 Highland Capital Management LP
 36027 -00002

Page: 55
 Invoice 127958
 May 31, 2021

				<u>Hours</u>	<u>Rate</u>	<u>Amount</u>
05/25/2021	JAM	BL	Prepare Notice of Service of Subpoena (NexBank) (0.2); e-mail to Z. Annable, G. Demo, H. Winograd re: Notice of Service of Subpoena (NexBank) (0.1); prepare Notice of Service of Subpoena (Advisors) (0.1); e-mail to Z. Annable, G. Demo, H. Winograd re: Notice of Service of Subpoena (Advisors) (0.1); meet and confer call w/ L. Phillips, M. Sbaiti re: document requests (0.5)	1.00	1245.00	\$1,245.00
05/25/2021	JAM	BL	Tel c. w/ G. Demo re: withdrawal of the reference hearing (0.1); prepare for withdrawal of the reference hearing (0.4); work on summary judgment against Dondero (notes litigation) (0.7); hearing on withdrawal of the reference (2.2); tel c. w/ J. Pomerantz re: hearing (0.1); tel c. w/ J. Seery, J. Dubel, J. Pomerantz, G. Demo re: hearing (0.4); telc . w/ G. Demo re: hearing, document production and related matters (0.3); e-mails w/ D. Klos, G. Demo re: document production (0.2); e-mails to L. Canty re: document production (Dondero notes litigation) (0.3); e-mails to Dondero's counsel re: document production (0.1)	4.80	1245.00	\$5,976.00
05/25/2021	LSC	BL	Prepare for and assist at hearing on motions to stay and status conference re motion to withdraw the reference.	2.30	460.00	\$1,058.00

D-CNL001146
Appx. 02806

Pachulski Stang Ziehl & Jones LLP
 Highland Capital Management LP
 36027 -00002

Page: 57
 Invoice 127958
 May 31, 2021

				<u>Hours</u>	<u>Rate</u>	<u>Amount</u>
05/26/2021	JAM	BL	Tel c. w/ D. Rukavina re: discovery concerning Advisors (notes litigation) (0.1); e-mails w/ D. Rukavina re: discovery concerning Advisors (notes litigation) (0.1); prepare for Dondero deposition (notes litigation) (3.0); e-mail to L. Canty re: exhibits for use in Dondero deposition (0.7); prepare written responses to Advisor's discovery requests (notes litigation) (2.4); review/revise written responses to Dondero's Third Set of Discovery Demands (0.7); e-mail to T. Surgent, D. Klos, G. Demo, H. Winograd re: written responses to Advisor's discovery requests (notes litigation) (0.2)	7.20	1245.00	\$8,964.00
05/26/2021	LSC	BL	Preparation of exhibits and materials in connection with J. Dondero's 5/28/21 deposition (Notes Litigation).	3.20	460.00	\$1,472.00

D-CNL001148
Appx. 02808

D-CNL001149
Appx. 02809

Pachulski Stang Ziehl & Jones LLP
 Highland Capital Management LP
 36027 - 00002

Page: 60
 Invoice 127958
 May 31, 2021

				<u>Hours</u>	<u>Rate</u>	<u>Amount</u>
05/28/2021	JNP	BL	Conference with John A. Morris regarding Dondero deposition on note litigation.	0.10	1295.00	\$129.50
05/28/2021	JAM	BL	Prepare for Dondero deposition (3.5); Dondero deposition (4.6); tel c. w/ J. Pomerantz re: Dondero deposition (0.1); tel c. w/ J. Seery re: Dondero deposition (0.3); e-mails w/ J. Seery, H. Winograd re: written responses to Advisor's discovery requests (0.2); e-mail to Bonds Ellis, J. Pomerantz, G. Demo, H. Winograd re: proposed order on stay (0.1)	8.80	1245.00	\$10,956.00
05/28/2021	LSC	BL	Preparation for and assist at deposition of Jim Dondero (notes litigation)	5.50	460.00	\$2,530.00
05/28/2021	GVD	BL	Conference with J. Morris and J. Seery re Dondero deposition and next steps	0.20	950.00	\$190.00
05/28/2021	GVD	BL	Attend Dondero Deposition (partial)	1.60	950.00	\$1,520.00

Pachulski Stang Ziehl & Jones LLP
 Highland Capital Management LP
 36027 - 00002

Page: 61
 Invoice 127958
 May 31, 2021

				<u>Hours</u>	<u>Rate</u>	<u>Amount</u>
05/28/2021	HRW	BL	Prepare responses and objections to HCMFA discovery in notes litigation (0.4)	0.40	695.00	\$278.00
05/28/2021	HRW	BL	Deposition of Dondero in connection with notes litigation (3.5)	3.50	695.00	\$2,432.50
05/28/2021	HRW	BL	Review production for NPA discovery requests in notes litigation (0.3)	0.30	695.00	\$208.50
05/29/2021	JAM	BL	E-mails to Counsel re: Zoom instructions for Tuesday's depositions (0.2); review Dondero written responses to discovery (0.2); e-mail to B. Assink, C. Taylor, J. Pomerantz, G. Demo, H. Winograd re: Dondero's written responses to discovery (0.2)	0.60	1245.00	\$747.00
05/29/2021	JAM	BL	Review HCMFA's second request for discovery (0.2); e-mails w/ T. Surgent, D. Klos, G. Demo, H. Winograd re: HCMFA's second request for discovery (0.1); review Dondero expert report (0.3); e-mails w/ J. Pomerantz, G. Demo, H. Winograd re: Dondero's expert report (0.2); draft written responses to HCRE's document requests, interrogatories, and requests for admission (3.1); e-mail to G. Demo, H. Winograd re: draft written responses to HCRE's document requests, interrogatories, and requests for admission (0.1); tel c. w/ H. Winograd re: opposition to HCRE/Services motion for leave to serve amended complaint and cross-motion for summary judgment (0.4)	4.40	1245.00	\$5,478.00

Pachulski Stang Ziehl & Jones LLP
 Highland Capital Management LP
 36027 - 00002

Page: 62
 Invoice 127958
 May 31, 2021

				<u>Hours</u>	<u>Rate</u>	<u>Amount</u>
			[REDACTED]			
05/29/2021	HRW	BL	Draft opposition to HCRE and HCMS motions for leave to amend answer in notes litigation (2.0)	2.00	695.00	\$1,390.00
05/29/2021	HRW	BL	Call with J. Morris re: opposition to HCRE and HCMS motions for leave to amend answer in notes litigation (0.3)	0.30	695.00	\$208.50
			[REDACTED]			
05/30/2021	JAM	BL	Review documents (1.9); tel c. w/ G. Demo re: document review/facts (1.1); e-mails w/ G. Demo re: facts (0.3); tel c. w/ G. Demo re: document review/facts (0.6); prepare for depositions (0.8)	4.70	1245.00	\$5,851.50
			[REDACTED]			
			[REDACTED]			
			[REDACTED]			
05/30/2021	GVD	BL	Conference with J. Morris re deposition preparation	0.60	950.00	\$570.00
			[REDACTED]			
05/30/2021	HRW	BL	Draft opposition to HCRE and HCMS motions for leave to amend answer in notes litigation (3.5)	3.50	695.00	\$2,432.50
			[REDACTED]			
05/31/2021	JAM	BL	Analyze G. Scott prior deposition transcript (2.4); analysis of use of Scott transcript, and e-mail to J. Pomerantz, G. Demo, H. Winograd concerning the same (0.6); prepare for Dondero and Scott depositions (6.4); e-mails w/ L. Canty re: deposition exhibits (0.2); tel c. w/ G. Demo, C. Wilkins re: potential conflicts (0.2); [REDACTED]	10.40	1245.00	\$12,948.00
			[REDACTED]			
05/31/2021	JAM	BL	Review/revise discovery requests for HCRE (notes litigation (0.4); e-mail to L. Drawhorn, G. Demo, H. Winograd, J. Rudd re: discovery requests for HCRE (notes litigation) (0.1); tel c. w/ H. Winograd re: status of brief for opposition to motion to amend (0.2)	0.70	1245.00	\$871.50

[illegible]

EXHIBIT 175

Pachulski Stang Ziehl & Jones LLP

10100 Santa Monica Blvd.
13th Floor
Los Angeles, CA 90067

Board of Directors
Highland Capital Management LP
300 Crescent Court ste. 700
Dallas, TX 75201

June 30, 2021
Invoice 128195
Client 36027
Matter 00002
JNP

RE: Postpetition

STATEMENT OF PROFESSIONAL SERVICES RENDERED THROUGH 06/30/2021

[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]

D-CNL001043
Appx. 02816

D-CNL001044
Appx. 02817

Pachulski Stang Ziehl & Jones LLP
 Highland Capital Management LP
 36027 -00002

Page: 17
 Invoice 128195
 June 30, 2021

				<u>Hours</u>	<u>Rate</u>	<u>Amount</u>
			Demo, H. Winograd re: comments to draft objection to HCMS motion for leave to amend answer (0.1); tel c. w/ J. Dubel re: expert report (0.1); tel c. w/ H. Winograd re: objections to HCRE and HCMS motions for leave to amend answer (0.1); review/revise objections to HCRE and HCMS motions for leave to amend answer (0.2); e-mails w/ G. Demo, H. Winograd, D. Klos, K. Hendrix, J. Donohue re: partial payment/performance by HCRE and HCMS (0.1); communications w/ H. Winograd, Z. Annable re: finalizing and filing objections to HCRE and HCMS motions for leave to amend answer (0.2)			
06/01/2021	LSC	BL	Draft declarations in support of oppositions to HCMS and HCRE motions to amend (1.1); assist with revising and finalizing of oppositions to HCMS and HCRE motions to amend (1.3); revise and finalize exhibits (.5).	2.90	460.00	\$1,334.00
06/01/2021	GVD	BL	Review and revise motion for leave to amend HCRE and HCMS answers	2.00	950.00	\$1,900.00
06/01/2021	HRW	BL	Draft opposition to HCRE and HCMS motions for leave to amend answer in notes litigation (12.5)	12.50	695.00	\$8,687.50
06/02/2021	JMF	BL	Review responses to motions for leave to amend answer.	0.40	1050.00	\$420.00

D-CNL001046
Appx. 02819

Pachulski Stang Ziehl & Jones LLP
 Highland Capital Management LP
 36027 -00002

Page: 19
 Invoice 128195
 June 30, 2021

				<u>Hours</u>	<u>Rate</u>	<u>Amount</u>
06/02/2021	HRW	BL	Review documents produced in Dondero notes litigation (0.1)	0.10	695.00	\$69.50
06/03/2021	JAM	BL	E-mail to L. Drawhorn, J. Rudd, J. Pomerantz, G. Demo re: motion to withdraw the reference and related matters (0.3); e-mails w/ M. Aigen, Dondero's other counsel, J. Pomerantz, G. Demo, H. Winograd re: scheduling of expert depositions (0.1); prepare notices of deposition for Nancy Dondero and Dondero's expert witnesses and send to Z. Annable, H. Winograd (0.2); review HCRE/HCMS motions (0.3)	0.90	1245.00	\$1,120.50
06/03/2021	LSC	BL	Review documents, redact, and prepare NexPoint document production (and address numerous issues with).	8.20	460.00	\$3,772.00
06/03/2021	GVD	BL	Correspondence with J. Donohue re demand letters on notes	0.20	950.00	\$190.00
06/03/2021	GVD	BL	Correspondence with J. Morris re HCRE/HCMS motions for leave to amend	0.20	950.00	\$190.00

D-CNL001048
Appx. 02821

D-CNL001049
Appx. 02822

D-CNL001050
Appx. 02823

D-CNL001051
Appx. 02824

D-CNL001052
Appx. 02825

Pachulski Stang Ziehl & Jones LLP
 Highland Capital Management LP
 36027 - 00002

Page: 25
 Invoice 128195
 June 30, 2021

				<u>Hours</u>	<u>Rate</u>	<u>Amount</u>
06/08/2021	HRW	BL	Communications with DSI re: HCMS discovery (0.3)	0.30	695.00	\$208.50
06/08/2021	HRW	BL	Draft R&Os to HCMS discovery (1.5)	1.50	695.00	\$1,042.50
06/08/2021	HRW	BL	Draft search terms for HCMS document production (1.0)	1.00	695.00	\$695.00
06/09/2021	JNP	BL	Review of motion to amend answer.	0.10	1295.00	\$129.50
06/09/2021	JNP	BL	Review motion to modify answer and emails regarding same.	0.20	1295.00	\$259.00
06/09/2021	JMF	BL	Review motion for leave to amend answer.	0.30	1050.00	\$315.00

Pachulski Stang Ziehl & Jones LLP
 Highland Capital Management LP
 36027 - 00002

Page: 26
 Invoice 128195
 June 30, 2021

				<u>Hours</u>	<u>Rate</u>	<u>Amount</u>
06/09/2021	JAM	BL	Review/revise R&Os to HCMS's discovery requests (0.7); e-mails with H. Winograd re: R&Os to HCMS's discovery requests (0.1).	0.80	1245.00	\$996.00
06/09/2021	LSC	BL	Preparation of document production to HCMS, including redaction of certain documents, and correspondence with H. Winograd regarding the same.	5.70	460.00	\$2,622.00
06/09/2021	HRW	BL	Draft R&Os for HCMS discovery demands (4.3)	4.30	695.00	\$2,988.50
06/09/2021	HRW	BL	Communicate with L. Canty re: HCMS document production (0.7)	0.70	695.00	\$486.50
06/09/2021	HRW	BL	Organize and review document production for HCMS (1.3)	1.30	695.00	\$903.50
06/09/2021	HRW	BL	Send HCMS productions in response to document requests (0.2)	0.20	695.00	\$139.00
06/09/2021	HRW	BL	Communicate with client re: R&OS to HCMS discovery and verification (0.2)	0.20	695.00	\$139.00
06/10/2021	IDK	BL	Office conference with J Morris re upcoming hearing this morning on notes litigation and presentation.	0.30	1325.00	\$397.50

D-CNL001055
Appx. 02828

Pachulski Stang Ziehl & Jones LLP
 Highland Capital Management LP
 36027 - 00002

Page: 28
 Invoice 128195
 June 30, 2021

				<u>Hours</u>	<u>Rate</u>	<u>Amount</u>
			conference with H. Winograd re: subpoena for PwC (0.1); telephone conference with D. Klos re: subpoena for PwC (0.1).			
06/10/2021	LSC	BL	Research in connection with subpoena and correspondence with H. Winograd regarding the same.	0.90	460.00	\$414.00
06/10/2021	LSC	BL	Prepare for and assist at hearing on motion to amend.	3.00	460.00	\$1,380.00
06/10/2021	GVD	BL	Attend hearing on motion to amend notes	2.50	950.00	\$2,375.00
06/10/2021	HRW	BL	Call with J. Morris re: PwC subpoenas (0.1)	0.10	695.00	\$69.50
06/10/2021	HRW	BL	Call with G. Demo re: HCMFA motion to amend (0.1)	0.10	695.00	\$69.50
06/10/2021	HRW	BL	Review HCMFA motion to amend (1.2)	1.20	695.00	\$834.00
06/10/2021	HRW	BL	Draft opposition to HCMFA motion to amend (0.6)	0.60	695.00	\$417.00
06/10/2021	HRW	BL	Draft document and deposition subpoenas for PwC (2.6)	2.60	695.00	\$1,807.00
06/10/2021	HRW	BL	Call with L. Canty re: PwC subpoenas (0.1)	0.10	695.00	\$69.50
06/10/2021	HRW	BL	Hearing on HCRE/HCMS motion to amend answer (1.0)	1.00	695.00	\$695.00

Pachulski Stang Ziehl & Jones LLP
 Highland Capital Management LP
 36027 - 00002

Page: 29
 Invoice 128195
 June 30, 2021

				<u>Hours</u>	<u>Rate</u>	<u>Amount</u>
06/11/2021	JNP	BL	Review emails regarding consolidation of notes litigation.	0.10	1295.00	\$129.50
06/11/2021	JNP	BL	Review of response to motion to quash.	0.10	1295.00	\$129.50
06/11/2021	JNP	BL	Conference with J. Seery, Robert J. Feinstein and Gregory V. Demo regarding status of Sentinel matters and next steps.	0.50	1295.00	\$647.50
06/11/2021	GVD	BL	Conference with J. Morris and H. Winograd re status of HCMFA amended answer	0.50	950.00	\$475.00
06/11/2021	GVD	BL	Correspondence with D. Rukavina re amendments to notes litigation	0.20	950.00	\$190.00
06/11/2021	HRW	BL	Draft subpoenas and ancillary documents for PwC in connection with HCMS notes litigation (1.6)	1.60	695.00	\$1,112.00
06/11/2021	HRW	BL	Send PwC subpoena to representative of PwC for HCMS notes litigation (0.2)	0.20	695.00	\$139.00
06/11/2021	HRW	BL	Communicate with local counsel and J. Morris re: subpoenas for PwC for HCMS notes litigation (0.6)	0.60	695.00	\$417.00
06/11/2021	HRW	BL	Meeting with client for notarization of ROG verification in connection with HCMS R&Os in notes litigation (0.1)	0.10	695.00	\$69.50

D-CNL001057

Appx. 02830

D-CNL001058
Appx. 02831

D-CNL001059
Appx. 02832

D-CNL001060
Appx. 02833

D-CNL001061
Appx. 02834

D-CNL001062
Appx. 02835

D-CNL001063
Appx. 02836

Pachulski Stang Ziehl & Jones LLP
 Highland Capital Management LP
 36027 -00002

Page: 36
 Invoice 128195
 June 30, 2021

				<u>Hours</u>	<u>Rate</u>	<u>Amount</u>
			(0.7); Review HCRE discovery schedule in notes litigation (0.1).			
06/18/2021	JAM	BL	Review PwC Subpoena from Dondero (0.1); tel c. w/ J. Seery re: PwC subpoena from Dondero (0.1); e-mails w/ M. Aigen, J. Pomerantz re: PwC subpoena and financial statements (0.1).	0.30	1245.00	\$373.50

D-CNL001065
Appx. 02838

Pachulski Stang Ziehl & Jones LLP
 Highland Capital Management LP
 36027 -00002

Page: 38
 Invoice 128195
 June 30, 2021

				<u>Hours</u>	<u>Rate</u>	<u>Amount</u>
06/21/2021	JNP	BL	Email to and from Gregory V. Demo regarding concerns with note defendant disposing of assets.	0.10	1295.00	\$129.50
06/21/2021	JAM	BL	Communications w/ M. Aigen, counsel for all defendants, J. Pomerantz, G. Demo, H. Winograd re: discovery and schedule for notes litigations (0.3).	0.30	1245.00	\$373.50

D-CNL001067
Appx. 02840

D-CNL001068
Appx. 02841

D-CNL001069
Appx. 02842

D-CNL001070
Appx. 02843

Pachulski Stang Ziehl & Jones LLP
 Highland Capital Management LP
 36027 - 00002

Page: 43
 Invoice 128195
 June 30, 2021

				<u>Hours</u>	<u>Rate</u>	<u>Amount</u>
			HCMFA proposed order (0.1); Call with J. Morris re: amending complaints in notes litigations (0.1); Research re: fraudulent transfer and other newly asserted claims for notes litigations (3.7); Draft amended complaint for notes litigation (3.2); Communicate with R. Half re: privilege review for notes litigations (0.1); Draft R&Os for HCMFA second RFPs (0.9).			
06/25/2021	IDK	BL	E-mails with G Demo re issues on Dondero conversion of HCMFA to holding company and impact on note litigation, and related background to same, including memo from Wilmer Hale on same.	0.40	1325.00	\$530.00
06/25/2021	JAM	BL	Tel c. w/ H. Winograd re: amended complaints for notes litigation (0.3).	0.30	1245.00	\$373.50
06/25/2021	GVD	BL	Correspondence with J. Morris and H. Winograd re preparation for amendment to the notes litigation	0.30	950.00	\$285.00

Pachulski Stang Ziehl & Jones LLP
 Highland Capital Management LP
 36027 -00002

Page: 44
 Invoice 128195
 June 30, 2021

				<u>Hours</u>	<u>Rate</u>	<u>Amount</u>
06/25/2021	HRW	BL	Draft amended complaint for notes litigation (3.8); Call with J. Morris re: amended complaints for notes litigation (0.2); Research re: additional claims in notes litigation (2.0); Review HCMFA discovery and production (0.2); Send counsel for HCMFA first production (0.1); Review outstanding litigation critical dates (0.4).	6.70	695.00	\$4,656.50
06/27/2021	JAM	BL	Review/revise draft Amended Complaint against Dondero (1.2); e-mails w/ H. Winograd, G. Demo re: revised Amended Complaint against Dondero (0.3).	1.50	1245.00	\$1,867.50
06/27/2021	HRW	BL	Draft amended complaint for notes litigation (6.5); Research re: additional claims for amended claim in notes litigation (1.0).	7.50	695.00	\$5,212.50

D-CNL001073
Appx. 02846

D-CNL001074
Appx. 02847

Pachulski Stang Ziehl & Jones LLP
 Highland Capital Management LP
 36027 -00002

Page: 47
 Invoice 128195
 June 30, 2021

				<u>Hours</u>	<u>Rate</u>	<u>Amount</u>
06/28/2021	HRW	BL	Draft amended complaint for notes litigation (1.6); Research re: additional claims for amended claim in notes litigation (1.0); Review HCMFA R&Os and production to discovery requests (0.4); Send HCMFA R&Os and production to opposing counsel (0.1); Call with L. Canty re: HCMFA production (0.1); Draft R&Os to HCRE discovery requests in notes litigation (0.6).	3.80	695.00	\$2,641.00
06/29/2021	JNP	BL	Review opposition to motion to withdraw reference.	0.30	1295.00	\$388.50

D-CNL001076
Appx. 02849

D-CNL001077
Appx. 02850

Pachulski Stang Ziehl & Jones LLP
 Highland Capital Management LP
 36027 -00002

Page: 50
 Invoice 128195
 June 30, 2021

				<u>Hours</u>	<u>Rate</u>	<u>Amount</u>
06/30/2021	JAM	BL	E-mails w/ G. Demo, H. Winograd re: potential claims in amended complaint (0.2); e-mails w/ G. Demo re: issues concerning proposed amended complaint (0.1); review draft responses and objections to discovery requests tendered by HCM (0.4); review HCMFA motion for protective order (0.3); e-mails w/ J. Vasek, D. Rukavina, J. Pomerantz, G. Demo, H. Winograd re: HCMFA motion for protective order (0.2); tel c. w/ J. Seery re: issues concerning potential amended complaint (0.4).	1.60	1245.00	\$1,992.00
06/30/2021	GVD	BL	Correspondence with PSZJ team re revisions to amended note complaint	0.20	950.00	\$190.00

D-CNL001079
Appx. 02852

EXHIBIT 176

Pachulski Stang Ziehl & Jones LLP

10100 Santa Monica Blvd.
13th Floor
Los Angeles, CA 90067

Board of Directors
Highland Capital Management LP
300 Crescent Court ste. 700
Dallas, TX 75201

July 31, 2021
Invoice 128292
Client 36027
Matter 00002
JNP

RE: Postpetition

STATEMENT OF PROFESSIONAL SERVICES RENDERED THROUGH 07/31/2021

[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]

D-CNL001018
Appx. 02855

D-CNL001019
Appx. 02856

Pachulski Stang Ziehl & Jones LLP
 Highland Capital Management LP
 36027 -00002

Page: 20
 Invoice 128292
 July 31, 2021

				<u>Hours</u>	<u>Rate</u>	<u>Amount</u>
07/02/2021	HRW	BL	Review supplemental production for HCMFA and NPA notes litigations (0.2); Send supplemental production for HCMFA and NPA notes litigations to opposing counsel (0.1).	0.30	695.00	\$208.50
07/03/2021	GVD	BL	Correspondence with J. Elkin re fraudulent conveyance actions in notes litigation	0.20	950.00	\$190.00
07/03/2021	JE	BL	Review additional transcripts and pleadings on fraudulent transfers; correspondence with Mr. Morris and Mr. Demo.	5.30	1195.00	\$6,333.50

D-CNL001021
Appx. 02858

D-CNL001022
Appx. 02859

Pachulski Stang Ziehl & Jones LLP
 Highland Capital Management LP
 36027 -00002

Page: 23
 Invoice 128292
 July 31, 2021

				<u>Hours</u>	<u>Rate</u>	<u>Amount</u>
07/07/2021	JNP	BL	Review Bankruptcy Court report and recommendation to District Court regarding withdrawal of reference.	0.10	1295.00	\$129.50
07/07/2021	JMF	BL	Review report and recommendations re notes adversary proceedings.	0.60	1050.00	\$630.00
07/07/2021	JAM	BL	E-mails w/ D. Rukavina re: proposed amended complaint (0.2).	0.20	1245.00	\$249.00

D-CNL001024
Appx. 02861

D-CNL001025
Appx. 02862

D-CNL001026
Appx. 02863

D-CNL001027
Appx. 02864

D-CNL001028
Appx. 02865

D-CNL001029
Appx. 02866

D-CNL001030
Appx. 02867

D-CNL001031
Appx. 02868

D-CNL001032
Appx. 02869

D-CNL001033
Appx. 02870

D-CNL001034
Appx. 02871

Pachulski Stang Ziehl & Jones LLP
 Highland Capital Management LP
 36027 -00002

Page: 39
 Invoice 128292
 July 31, 2021

				<u>Hours</u>	<u>Rate</u>	<u>Amount</u>
			(0.2).			
07/21/2021	JNP	BL	Review brief regarding report and recommendation on withdrawal of reference and emails regarding same.	0.10	1295.00	\$129.50
07/21/2021	JAM	BL	E-mail to J. Vasek, D. Rukavina, J. Pomerantz, H. Wingrad re: motion for protective order (0.3); e-mails w/ M. Aigen re: scheduling stipulation (0.1); e-mails w/ L. Drawhorn, J. Wander re: PwC subpoena (0.2); e-mail to D. Rukavina re: PwC subpoena (0.2).	0.80	1245.00	\$996.00

Pachulski Stang Ziehl & Jones LLP
 Highland Capital Management LP
 36027 -00002

Page: 41
 Invoice 128292
 July 31, 2021

				<u>Hours</u>	<u>Rate</u>	<u>Amount</u>
07/23/2021	IDK	BL	E-mails with local counsel, J. Pomerantz re issues on Dondero entities objections in District Court to Report & Recommendations and procedural issues on same and opposition to motion to strike, including review of rules (.5); E-mails with J. Pomerantz and J. Morris re same and need for draft motion to strike (.3).	0.80	1325.00	\$1,060.00
07/23/2021	JNP	BL	Review and respond to email regarding stipulation to consolidate notes matters and open issues.	0.10	1295.00	\$129.50
07/23/2021	JAM	BL	E-mails w/ J. Wander, L. Drawhorn, D. Rukavina re: PwC subpoena, document production, and deposition (0.4); prepare Notices of Deposition (PwC) for each of the five adversary proceedings (including revisions based on comments received) (0.8); e-mail to Z. Annable re: PwC subpoena and Notices of Deposition (0.2).	1.40	1245.00	\$1,743.00
07/24/2021	IDK	BL	E-mails and telephone conference with J. Pomerantz re Dondero objection to R&R and need for motion to strike (.4); E-mails with J. Kim re same and relevant background (.3); E-mails with G Demo re same and related docs (.2).	0.90	1325.00	\$1,192.50

D-CNL001037
Appx. 02874

Pachulski Stang Ziehl & Jones LLP
 Highland Capital Management LP
 36027 -00002

Page: 43
 Invoice 128292
 July 31, 2021

				<u>Hours</u>	<u>Rate</u>	<u>Amount</u>
07/26/2021	JNP	BL	Review and respond to email regarding motion to strike objection to report and recommendation regarding withdrawal of reference.	0.10	1295.00	\$129.50
07/26/2021	RJF	BL	Review draft motion to strike objection to reference report and related emails.	0.40	1395.00	\$558.00
07/26/2021	JAM	BL	Review/analyze HCMLP's audited financials from 2008 to 2016 (1.8); e-mail to J. Seery, D. Klos, J. Pomerantz, G. Demo, H. Winograd re: production of audited financials (0.2).	2.00	1245.00	\$2,490.00

D-CNL001039
Appx. 02876

Pachulski Stang Ziehl & Jones LLP
 Highland Capital Management LP
 36027 -00002

Page: 46
 Invoice 128292
 July 31, 2021

				<u>Hours</u>	<u>Rate</u>	<u>Amount</u>
07/29/2021	JMF	BL	Review notes adversary proceedings district and bankruptcy dockets and draft memorandum re pending issues and status re same.	2.10	1050.00	\$2,205.00
07/29/2021	JAM	BL	Review audited financial statements and prepare for PwC deposition (1.1); e-mails w/ M. Aigen, L. Canty re: PwC financial statements (0.2); e-mails w/ L. Drawhorn, J. Seery re: Wick Phillips proposed withdrawal from notes litigation (0.1).	1.40	1245.00	\$1,743.00
07/29/2021	HRW	BL	Send production to opposing counsel for notes litigation (0.1).	0.10	695.00	\$69.50
07/29/2021	HRW	BL	Review objections to R&Rs issued in notes litigations (0.5).	0.50	695.00	\$347.50
07/29/2021	HRW	BL	Review and edit chart of District Court proceedings for notes litigations (0.6).	0.60	695.00	\$417.00

Pachulski Stang Ziehl & Jones LLP
 Highland Capital Management LP
 36027 -00002

Page: 47
 Invoice 128292
 July 31, 2021

				<u>Hours</u>	<u>Rate</u>	<u>Amount</u>
07/30/2021	JNP	BL	Email to and from Jonathan J. Kim regarding status of reports and recommendations in connection with motion to withdraw reference.	0.20	1295.00	\$259.00
07/30/2021	JAM	BL	E-mail to L. Lambert, M. Clemente, J. Pomerantz re: Advisors' motion for protective order (0.2); prepare for PwC deposition (4.3); PwC deposition (2.0).	6.50	1245.00	\$8,092.50
07/30/2021	HRW	BL	Review pleadings in District Court notes litigations (1.0).	1.00	695.00	\$695.00
07/30/2021	HRW	BL	Review deadlines for District Court notes litigations (0.5).	0.50	695.00	\$347.50
07/30/2021	HRW	BL	Deposition of Peet Burger for notes litigations (2.0).	2.00	695.00	\$1,390.00

EXHIBIT 177

Pachulski Stang Ziehl & Jones LLP

10100 Santa Monica Blvd.
13th Floor
Los Angeles, CA 90067

Board of Directors
Highland Capital Management LP
300 Crescent Court ste. 700
Dallas, TX 75201

August 31, 2021
Invoice 128567
Client 36027
Matter 00003
JNP

RE: Post-Effective Date

STATEMENT OF PROFESSIONAL SERVICES RENDERED THROUGH 08/31/2021

██████████	██████████
██████████	██████████
████████████████████	██████████
██████████████████	██████████

Pachulski Stang Ziehl & Jones LLP
 Highland Capital Management LP
 36027 -00003

Page: 37
 Invoice 128567
 August 31, 2021

Notes Litigation

08/11/2021	JJK	NL	Prepare HCM objection to motion to reconsider.	4.20	995.00	\$4,179.00
08/11/2021	JAM	NL	Review stipulations for each adversary proceeding (0.4); e-mails w/ M. Aigen re: scheduling stipulations (0.1).	0.50	1245.00	\$622.50
08/11/2021	HRW	NL	Draft motion to file amended complaints for notes litigations (2.8)	2.80	695.00	\$1,946.00
08/12/2021	JJK	NL	Research and prepare replies re: Reports, motions to reconsider; emails Kharasch on same.	5.20	995.00	\$5,174.00
08/12/2021	LSC	NL	Retrieve and transmit Reports and Recommendations regarding notes litigations for J. Morris.	0.30	460.00	\$138.00
08/12/2021	HRW	NL	Draft motion to file amended complaints for notes litigations (3.0)	3.00	695.00	\$2,085.00
08/13/2021	IDK	NL	E-mail H Winograd re updated litigation WIP list with focus on deadlines re matters on Dondero entities motions for withdrawal of reference.	0.20	1325.00	\$265.00
08/13/2021	IDK	NL	E-mail J Kim re draft of response to HCMS motion to reconsider to D Court, including review of same and new argument.	0.40	1325.00	\$530.00
08/13/2021	JAM	NL	Review motion to amend complaint and proposed orders (0.9); e-mails w/ G. Demo, H. Winograd re: motion to amend complaint and proposed orders (0.2); e-mails w/ M. Aigen, others, re: scheduling order and motion to amend complaints (0.4).	1.50	1245.00	\$1,867.50
08/13/2021	GVD	NL	Review open issues re notes litigation and correspondence with H. Winograd re same	0.40	950.00	\$380.00
08/13/2021	HRW	NL	Edit and finalize motions to file amended complaints in notes litigations (1.2).	1.20	695.00	\$834.00
08/16/2021	IDK	NL	Review and consider revised response to HCMS motion to reconsider R&R (.3); E-mails with J Pomerantz re same and Texas litigation counsel (.2); E-mails with J Kim re my feedback on draft of same and timing for filing today (.2).	0.70	1325.00	\$927.50
08/16/2021	JJK	NL	Emails Kharasch, Pomerantz on motions to reconsider; related research and final revisions to last reply re: Reports.	1.50	995.00	\$1,492.50
08/16/2021	JNP	NL	Review response to motion for reconsideration of	0.10	1295.00	\$129.50

D-CNL001155

Appx. 02881

Pachulski Stang Ziehl & Jones LLP
 Highland Capital Management LP
 36027 -00003

Page: 38
 Invoice 128567
 August 31, 2021

				<u>Hours</u>	<u>Rate</u>	<u>Amount</u>
			order adopting report and recommendations.			
08/17/2021	JAM	NL	Review/revise motions for leave to amend complaints in Notes Litigation (1.1); e-mail to L. Canty, Z. Annable, H. Winograd re: motions for leave to amend complaints in Notes Litigation and related matters (0.2); e-mails w/ Z. Annable, H. Winograd re: motions to amend complaints in Notes Litigation (0.1).	1.40	1245.00	\$1,743.00
08/17/2021	LSC	NL	Prepare and transmit exhibits to motions to amend.	0.50	460.00	\$230.00
08/18/2021	JAM	NL	Communications w/ M. Aigen, Z. Annable re: form of Order for motions for leave to amend complaints (0.2); tel c. w/ D. Rukavina re: Advisors' motion for protective order (0.2).	0.40	1245.00	\$498.00
08/18/2021	LSC	NL	Transmit proposed orders on motions to amend.	0.20	460.00	\$92.00
08/19/2021	JAM	NL	Revise Advisors' draft Stipulation resolving their motion for a protective order (0.5); draft e-mail to D. Rukavina re: revised Stipulation resolving Advisors' motion for a protective order (0.2).	0.70	1245.00	\$871.50
08/20/2021	JNP	NL	Conference with John A. Morris regarding protective order regarding notes litigation.	0.20	1295.00	\$259.00
08/20/2021	JAM	NL	E-mails w/ D. Rukavina re: proposed settlement of motion for protective order (0.1); e-mails w/ J. Seery, J. Pomerantz, G. Demo re: Advisors' motion for a protective order (0.1).	0.20	1245.00	\$249.00
08/24/2021	HRW	NL	Draft notice of filing stipulations re: notes litigation (2.2).	2.20	695.00	\$1,529.00
08/25/2021	JAM	NL	E-mails w/ H. Winograd re: HCMFA scheduling stipulation (0.1).	0.10	1245.00	\$124.50
08/25/2021	HRW	NL	Draft proposed orders re: notes litigation (2.5); Communicate with opposing counsel for HCMFA re: notes stipulation (0.1).	2.60	695.00	\$1,807.00
08/26/2021	JAM	NL	E-mails w/ H. Winograd, Z. Annable re: filing of Amended Complaints (0.2); e-mails w/ H. Winograd, D. Rukavina re: scheduling order for HCMFA notes litigation (not subject to amended complaint) (0.2).	0.40	1245.00	\$498.00
08/26/2021	LSC	NL	Prepare exhibits to amended complaints (.7); prepare exhibits to orders approving discovery stipulations (.3).	1.00	460.00	\$460.00
08/26/2021	HRW	NL	Prepare and review amended complaints and	1.70	695.00	\$1,181.50

D-CNL001157
Appx. 02883

EXHIBIT 178

Pachulski Stang Ziehl & Jones LLP

10100 Santa Monica Blvd.
13th Floor
Los Angeles, CA 90067

Board of Directors
Highland Capital Management LP
300 Crescent Court ste. 700
Dallas, TX 75201

August 10, 2021
Invoice 128474
Client 36027
Matter 00002
JNP

RE: Postpetition

STATEMENT OF PROFESSIONAL SERVICES RENDERED THROUGH 08/10/2021

[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]

D-CNL000960
Appx. 02886

D-CNL000961
Appx. 02887

Pachulski Stang Ziehl & Jones LLP
 Highland Capital Management LP
 36027 - 00002

Page: 11
 Invoice 128474
 August 10, 2021

				<u>Hours</u>	<u>Rate</u>	<u>Amount</u>
			production and search issues.			
05/25/2021	CHM	BL	Emails with J. Morris and B. Sharp re document production.	0.30	750.00	\$225.00
05/26/2021	CHM	BL	Prepare Nexpoint document production and check document being produced; email H. Winograd re same.	3.20	750.00	\$2,400.00
05/26/2021	CHM	BL	Review email from H. Winograd re RFPs and reply.	0.10	750.00	\$75.00
05/27/2021	CHM	BL	Review requests for production and documents being produced and search terms run for completeness.	4.00	750.00	\$3,000.00
05/27/2021	CHM	BL	Review search terms and exchange emails with H. Winograd and IDS team re new production searches.	1.10	750.00	\$825.00
05/28/2021	CHM	BL	Review email from J. Vaughn and reply.	0.10	750.00	\$75.00
05/28/2021	CHM	BL	Run document production and review of documents being produced.	1.80	750.00	\$1,350.00
06/02/2021	CHM	BL	Review document production issues and coordinate with IDS team re same.	0.30	750.00	\$225.00
06/02/2021	CHM	BL	Email H. Winograd re document production issues.	0.10	750.00	\$75.00
06/03/2021	CHM	BL	Review RFPs and coordinate searches with IDS team; review document hits re same.	3.20	750.00	\$2,400.00
06/04/2021	CHM	BL	Review UDF documents for responsiveness and run production re same.	4.30	750.00	\$3,225.00
06/07/2021	CHM	BL	Review email from B. Sharp and reply.	0.10	750.00	\$75.00
06/07/2021	CHM	BL	Review RFPs and proposed search terms; email IDS team re same and review results.	2.50	750.00	\$1,875.00
06/09/2021	CHM	BL	Correspond with G. Crane and H. Winograd re privilege review and begin preparation of privilege assignments.	3.00	750.00	\$2,250.00
06/09/2021	CHM	BL	Review documents for responsiveness and run production.	3.70	750.00	\$2,775.00
06/09/2021	CHM	BL	Email IDS team re additional searches.	0.20	750.00	\$150.00
06/10/2021	CHM	BL	Review parties list and update privilege breaker list and email same to G. Demo.	1.80	750.00	\$1,350.00
06/10/2021	CHM	BL	Review email from J. Sommer re UDF privilege holdback and reply.	0.10	750.00	\$75.00
06/11/2021	CHM	BL	Review documents flagged by G. Crane and reply re same.	0.30	750.00	\$225.00
06/11/2021	JAM	BL	Telephone conference with G. Demo, H. Winograd re: HCMFA and NexPoint motions to amend (0.5);	1.80	1245.00	\$2,241.00

D-CNL000962

Appx. 02888

Pachulski Stang Ziehl & Jones LLP
 Highland Capital Management LP
 36027 - 00002

Page: 12
 Invoice 128474
 August 10, 2021

				<u>Hours</u>	<u>Rate</u>	<u>Amount</u>
			telephone conference with J. Seery re: HCMFA and NexPoint motion to amend (0.1); e-mail to D. Rukavina, J. Vasek, J. Pomerantz, G. Demo, H. Winograd re: proposed amended complaints for HCMFA and NexPoint in notes litigation (0.4); e-mail to D. Rukavina, J. Vasek, J. Pomerantz, G. Demo, H. Winograd re: Rule 30(b)(6) notices in notes litigation (0.2); review/revise subpoena for PwC for HCMFA and NexPoint notes litigation (0.3); communications w/ H. Winograd, Z. Annable re: substance of PwC subpoena and issues concerning service (0.3).			
06/12/2021	CHM	BL	Review email from J. Morris re G. Crane privilege review and reply.	0.10	750.00	\$75.00
06/15/2021	CHM	BL	Review email from G. Crane re privilege review and reply.	0.10	750.00	\$75.00
06/15/2021	CHM	BL	Create and update privilege review assignments and email G. Crane re same.	1.00	750.00	\$750.00
06/15/2021	CHM	BL	Review discovery and deadline tracker and update; coordinate with H. Winograd re next priority.	0.50	750.00	\$375.00
06/15/2021	CHM	BL	Emails with G. Crane re parameters of privilege review and RFPs for responsiveness review.	0.20	750.00	\$150.00
06/15/2021	CHM	BL	Review G. Crane privilege tagging re HCMS production; email H. Winograd re same.	0.80	750.00	\$600.00
06/16/2021	CHM	BL	Emails with J. Morris, G. Demo and IDS team re additional custodian collection.	0.20	750.00	\$150.00
06/21/2021	CHM	BL	Review RFP and proposed search terms and coordinate searches with IDS team.	0.50	750.00	\$375.00
06/22/2021	CHM	BL	Exchange emails with IDS team re requested searches.	0.10	750.00	\$75.00

Pachulski Stang Ziehl & Jones LLP
 Highland Capital Management LP
 36027 - 00002

Page: 13
 Invoice 128474
 August 10, 2021

				<u>Hours</u>	<u>Rate</u>	<u>Amount</u>
06/23/2021	CHM	BL	Review email from H. Winograd re HCMFA document searches and reply.	0.10	750.00	\$75.00
06/23/2021	CHM	BL	Review RFP and coordinate additional searches with IDS team.	0.50	750.00	\$375.00
06/24/2021	CHM	BL	Review email from G. Crane re coding issues; review database and impacted documents.	0.60	750.00	\$450.00
06/24/2021	CHM	BL	Draft email to IDS team re pending documents.	0.40	750.00	\$300.00
06/24/2021	CHM	BL	Review documents for responsiveness and run production re first portion of HCMFA documents.	3.90	750.00	\$2,925.00
06/28/2021	CHM	BL	Review email from G. Crane re review status and reply.	0.10	750.00	\$75.00
06/28/2021	CHM	BL	Review documents for responsiveness and run production re 2nd set of HCMFA requests.	3.50	750.00	\$2,625.00
07/01/2021	CHM	BL	Email G. Crane re privilege review; review UDF privileged documents.	1.10	750.00	\$825.00
07/01/2021	CHM	BL	Review RFPs, run preliminary searches in existing database and email IDS re HCRE search terms.	0.60	750.00	\$450.00
07/01/2021	LSC	BL	Prepare supplemental HCMFA production.	0.30	460.00	\$138.00
07/01/2021	LSC	BL	Preparation of NPA supplemental production.	0.30	460.00	\$138.00
07/02/2021	CHM	BL	Draft email to IDS team re privilege filter issue.	0.30	750.00	\$225.00
07/02/2021	CHM	BL	Review prior productions re privilege filter issues.	3.30	750.00	\$2,475.00
07/06/2021	CHM	BL	Review email from IDS re UBS results and reply.	0.10	750.00	\$75.00

D-CNL000964

Appx. 02890

Pachulski Stang Ziehl & Jones LLP
 Highland Capital Management LP
 36027 - 00002

Page: 14
 Invoice 128474
 August 10, 2021

				<u>Hours</u>	<u>Rate</u>	<u>Amount</u>
07/06/2021	LSC	BL	Research and correspondence regarding privileged documents and supplemental document production.	0.90	460.00	\$414.00
07/07/2021	LAF	BL	Legal research re: Withdrawal of reference; update chart of rules/general orders in various districts.	3.30	475.00	\$1,567.50
07/08/2021	CHM	BL	Review HCRE search results and email IDS re same.	1.80	750.00	\$1,350.00
07/08/2021	CHM	BL	Run production re HCRE search results and review same; email link to H. Winograd.	2.00	750.00	\$1,500.00
07/08/2021	CHM	BL	Review email from K. Kim re privilege filter and reply.	0.10	750.00	\$75.00
07/08/2021	LSC	BL	Retrieve and review HCRE document production.	1.70	460.00	\$782.00
07/09/2021	CHM	BL	Review search results and begin production of certain UBS documents.	5.00	750.00	\$3,750.00
07/12/2021	LSC	BL	Circulate responses to Court's order requiring disclosures and correspondence regarding the same.	0.30	460.00	\$138.00
07/12/2021	LSC	BL	Review Dondero designation, related documents and correspondence with J. Morris regarding same.	0.50	460.00	\$230.00
07/15/2021	JEO	BL	Review court ordered disclosures	1.00	1050.00	\$1,050.00

D-CNL000966
Appx. 02892

Pachulski Stang Ziehl & Jones LLP
 Highland Capital Management LP
 36027 - 00002

Page: 16
 Invoice 128474
 August 10, 2021

				<u>Hours</u>	<u>Rate</u>	<u>Amount</u>
07/24/2021	JJK	BL	Emails Kharasch on Debtor's motion to strike Dondero objection to R&R.	0.30	995.00	\$298.50
07/25/2021	JJK	BL	Research and review pleadings and prepare motion to strike Dondero objection to R&R.	3.40	995.00	\$3,383.00
07/25/2021	JJK	BL	Research, review documents, and prepare motion to strike Dondero objection.	5.90	995.00	\$5,870.50
07/27/2021	LSC	BL	Redact supplemental document production.	3.20	460.00	\$1,472.00
07/28/2021	IDK	BL	E-mails with local counsel and J Pomerantz re new motion for reconsideration filed in District Court to R&R by HCMSI, and next steps re same, and review of same (.5); E-mails with J Kim re same and need to respond to HCMSI pleadings (.2).	0.70	1325.00	\$927.50

Pachulski Stang Ziehl & Jones LLP
 Highland Capital Management LP
 36027 - 00002

Page: 17
 Invoice 128474
 August 10, 2021

				<u>Hours</u>	<u>Rate</u>	<u>Amount</u>
07/28/2021	IDK	BL	Review of District Court order adopting R&R of Judge Jurnigan re NexPoint Advisors and its objection to the R&R (.2); E-mails with J Kim re same (.2).	0.40	1325.00	\$530.00
07/28/2021	JJK	BL	Emails Kharasch on multiple replies/objections re: reference withdrawal and consider same.	0.20	995.00	\$199.00
07/28/2021	JJK	BL	Research, analysis, pleading review to prepare multiple replies re: reference withdrawal.	5.00	995.00	\$4,975.00
07/29/2021	IDK	BL	E-mails with J Kim, others on the status of the 5 objections/motions for reconsideration to bankruptcy court R&R to District Court and issues on our various responses to same (.4); E-mails with H Winograd and J Fried re same and re deadlines to same and updated chart (.2).	0.60	1325.00	\$795.00
07/29/2021	JJK	BL	Research and prepare replies to Dondero, et al. re: bankruptcy court reports.	3.90	995.00	\$3,880.50
07/29/2021	JJK	BL	Review pleadings, research, and prepare replies to Dondero, et al., re: bankruptcy court reports.	4.50	995.00	\$4,477.50
07/29/2021	JEO	BL	Email follow up on critical dates issue regarding deposition scheduling	0.20	1050.00	\$210.00
07/29/2021	RJF	BL	Prepare for Ellington deposition, including review of exhibits.	0.50	1395.00	\$697.50
07/29/2021	RJF	BL	Attend Ellington deposition.	10.00	1395.00	\$13,950.00
07/29/2021	LSC	BL	Prepare for Burger deposition.	0.70	460.00	\$322.00
07/29/2021	LSC	BL	Preparation of Consolidated Notes Litigation Production.	2.40	460.00	\$1,104.00
07/30/2021	CHM	BL	Email correspondence re non-email document collection.	0.50	750.00	\$375.00
07/30/2021	CHM	BL	Email IDS team re Surgent screenshot.	0.10	750.00	\$75.00

Pachulski Stang Ziehl & Jones LLP
 Highland Capital Management LP
 36027 - 00002

Page: 18
 Invoice 128474
 August 10, 2021

				<u>Hours</u>	<u>Rate</u>	<u>Amount</u>
07/30/2021	IDK	BL	E-mails with J Kim, others on status/issues on the 5 Dondero related motions to withdraw the reference and response status/drafts (.4); E-mails with local counsel, H Winograd on updates to timing on filing responses to same (.1).	0.50	1325.00	\$662.50
07/30/2021	JJK	BL	Research and prepare replies/objections to Dondero, et al. re: bankruptcy court reports.	5.70	995.00	\$5,671.50
07/30/2021	RJF	BL	Emails regarding reference reports.	0.20	1395.00	\$279.00
07/30/2021	LSC	BL	Prepare for and assist at deposition of Peet Burger.	3.00	460.00	\$1,380.00
07/31/2021	IDK	BL	Review of correspondence to Texas litigation specialists on various questions on motions to withdraw reference and related objections to R&R.	0.20	1325.00	\$265.00
07/31/2021	JJK	BL	Research, prepare replies/objections re: bankruptcy court's reports & recommendations.	5.50	995.00	\$5,472.50
08/01/2021	JJK	BL	Research, review documents, and prepare replies to objections to reports/recommendations and opposition to motion to reconsider.	5.20	995.00	\$5,174.00
08/01/2021	JJK	BL	Prepare replies to objections to reports/recommendations and motion to reconsider.	3.60	995.00	\$3,582.00

Pachulski Stang Ziehl & Jones LLP
 Highland Capital Management LP
 36027 -00002

Page: 19
 Invoice 128474
 August 10, 2021

				<u>Hours</u>	<u>Rate</u>	<u>Amount</u>
08/02/2021	IDK	BL	Review and consider correspondence between H Winograd and local counsel re deadlines to object to pleadings on 5 matters re report and rec to D Court as well as H Winograd of chart on all related actions (.5).	0.50	1325.00	\$662.50
08/02/2021	IDK	BL	E-mails with J Kim re 5 outstanding motions to withdraw reference and objections to report and rec by defendants, and various issues on opponents bias of judge argument (.4); Telephone conference with J Kim re same (.3).	0.70	1325.00	\$927.50
08/02/2021	IDK	BL	E-mails with special Texas litigation counsel on notes litigation and withdrawal of ref and coordination of call re same (.2).	0.20	1325.00	\$265.00
08/02/2021	JJK	BL	Review objections to bankruptcy court reports and prepare additonal responses thereto.	1.20	995.00	\$1,194.00
08/02/2021	JJK	BL	Calls Kharasch re: replies to objections to reports/recommendations.	0.10	995.00	\$99.50
08/02/2021	JJK	BL	Call Kharasch on several replies re: withdrawal of reference.	0.20	995.00	\$199.00
08/02/2021	JJK	BL	Revise replies re: objections to withdrawal of reference, etc.	0.20	995.00	\$199.00
08/02/2021	JJK	BL	Prepare replies to objections to Reports, etc.	1.20	995.00	\$1,194.00

Pachulski Stang Ziehl & Jones LLP
 Highland Capital Management LP
 36027 - 00002

Page: 21
 Invoice 128474
 August 10, 2021

				<u>Hours</u>	<u>Rate</u>	<u>Amount</u>
08/02/2021	JE	BL	Work on vexatious litigant memo.	6.20	1195.00	\$7,409.00
08/03/2021	IDK	BL	Review and consider J Kim's draft of response to Dondero objection in District Court to bankruptcy report and recommendation and need for changes (.3); Numerous E-mails with J Kim re need for extensive revisions to same and his responses and new draft re same (.5); E-mail H Winograd re materials to supplement same response (.1).	0.90	1325.00	\$1,192.50
08/03/2021	JJK	BL	Review objections to reports/recommendations and prepare additional replies thereto for filing.	4.80	995.00	\$4,776.00
08/03/2021	JJK	BL	Emails local counsel, Winograd on Debtor replies re: reports and consider issues (0.6); emails Kharasch, Pomerantz on Dondero and HCMFA replies (0.1); prepare replies re: Reports and related research/analysis (2.2).	2.90	995.00	\$2,885.50
08/03/2021	JNP	BL	Conference with John A. Morris and D. Ashby regarding continued investigation.	0.50	1295.00	\$647.50
08/03/2021	JNP	BL	Conference with Farralon, Holland & Knight, John A. Morris and Gregory V. Demo regarding Dondero discovery action.	0.50	1295.00	\$647.50
08/						

D-CNL000971

Appx. 02897

Pachulski Stang Ziehl & Jones LLP
 Highland Capital Management LP
 36027 -00002

Page: 22
 Invoice 128474
 August 10, 2021

				<u>Hours</u>	<u>Rate</u>	<u>Amount</u>
08/03/2021	HRW	BL	Research and draft response to HCMFA objection to R&R in notes litigation (1.5)	1.50	695.00	\$1,042.50
08/03/2021	HRW	BL	Review notes litigations deadlines (0.6)	0.60	695.00	\$417.00
08/04/2021	IDK	BL	Telephone conferences with J Morris and J Pomerantz re result of hearing today as well as need for his comments to draft response to Dondero objection to Report and Recommendation to District Court (.4); Telephone conference with J Pomerantz re timing on filing given feedback of litigation	0.60	1325.00	\$795.00

D-CNL000973
Appx. 02899

Pachulski Stang Ziehl & Jones LLP
 Highland Capital Management LP
 36027 -00002

Page: 24
 Invoice 128474
 August 10, 2021

				<u>Hours</u>	<u>Rate</u>	<u>Amount</u>
						0
08/04/2021	JAM	BL	Review/revise draft response to Dondero objection to Report and Recommendations (1.1); e-mail to I. Kharasch, J. Kim, G. Demo re: revised draft response to Dondero objection to Report and Recommendations (0.1).	1.20	1245.00	\$1,494.00
08/04/2021						
08/05/2021	IDK	BL	E-mail J Kim re his draft response to HCMFA objection to R&R, including review of same (.3); E-mails with J Morris re same and his changes, along with final response (.3).	0.60	1325.00	\$795.00
08/05/2021	JJK	BL	Emails Morris on HCMFA reply matters.	0.10	995.00	\$99.50
08/05/2021	JJK	BL	Continue work on replies and filing thereof to objections to reports/recommendations.	4.20	995.00	\$4,179.00
08/05/2021	JJK	BL	Emails Morris on HCMFA reply and review comments.	0.10	995.00	\$99.50

D-CNL000975
Appx. 02901

Pachulski Stang Ziehl & Jones LLP
 Highland Capital Management LP
 36027 - 00002

Page: 26
 Invoice 128474
 August 10, 2021

				<u>Hours</u>	<u>Rate</u>	<u>Amount</u>
08/05/2021	JMF	BL	Review response to opposition to bankruptcy court recommendations to district court.	0.30	1050.00	\$315.00
08/05/2021	JAM	BL	Review/revise objection to HCMFA motion for reconsideration of report and recommendations on notes litigation (0.9); e-mails w/ J. Kim, I. Kharasch re: revisions to objection to HCMFA motion for reconsideration of report and recommendations on notes litigation (0.1).	1.00	1245.00	\$1,245.00
08/05/2021	GVD	BL	Correspondence with working group re status of notes litigation	0.20	950.00	\$190.00
08/06/2021	IDK	BL	Review of draft response to HCRE objection in D Court to R&R, along with J Kim commentary on same.	0.40	1325.00	\$530.00

D-CNL000977
Appx. 02903

D-CNL000978
Appx. 02904

EXHIBIT 179

Pachulski Stang Ziehl & Jones LLP

10100 Santa Monica Blvd.
13th Floor
Los Angeles, CA 90067

Board of Directors
Highland Capital Management LP
300 Crescent Court ste. 700
Dallas, TX 75201

September 30, 2021

Invoice 128688

Client 36027

Matter 00003

JNP

RE: Post-Effective Date

STATEMENT OF PROFESSIONAL SERVICES RENDERED THROUGH 09/30/2021

██████████	████████████████████
██████████████████	████████████████████
██	████████████████████
██	████████████████████
██	████████████████████
██	████████████████████

D-CNL003813
Appx. 02907

Pachulski Stang Ziehl & Jones LLP
 Highland Capital Management LP
 36027 - 00003

Page: 43
 Invoice 128688
 September 30, 2021

				<u>Hours</u>	<u>Rate</u>	<u>Amount</u>
			litigations (3.5).			
09/05/2021	HRW	NL	Review motions for stay and arbitration in notes litigations (1.5).	1.50	695.00	\$1,042.50
09/06/2021	GVD	NL	Conference with J. Morris re notes litigation	0.20	950.00	\$190.00
09/06/2021	HRW	NL	Draft discovery requests for consolidated notes litigations (9.5).	9.50	695.00	\$6,602.50
09/07/2021	JMF	NL	Review scheduling orders re notes litigation adversaries.	0.30	1050.00	\$315.00
09/07/2021	JAM	NL	Review draft discovery demands for notes litigation (0.6); tel c. w/ H. Winograd re: discovery issues (0.3); communications w/ D. Klos, J. Seery re: cost/value of MGM, RCP, Trussway (0.2); draft discovery requests for NexPoint (0.5); tel c. w/ H. Winograd re: discovery demands (0.1); review revised discovery demands (0.5); e-mails w/ H. Winograd re: final versions of discovery demands (0.1).	2.30	1245.00	\$2,863.50
09/07/2021	HRW	NL	Call with J. Morris re: notes litigation discovery (0.3).	0.30	695.00	\$208.50
09/07/2021	HRW	NL	Call with J. Morris re: notes litigation arbitration motions (0.4).	0.40	695.00	\$278.00
09/07/2021	HRW	NL	Draft discovery requests for consolidated notes litigations.	6.80	695.00	\$4,726.00
09/07/2021	HRW	NL	Serve discovery requests on opposing counsel for consolidated notes litigations.	0.20	695.00	\$139.00
09/08/2021	JJK	NL	Emails Kharasch on reference matters and consider/research same.	1.30	995.00	\$1,293.50
09/08/2021	GVD	NL	Correspondence re email discovery issues	0.20	950.00	\$190.00
09/08/2021	GVD	NL	Conference with J. Morris re additional notes litigation	0.20	950.00	\$190.00
09/09/2021	JNP	NL	Conference with John A. Morris regarding response to arbitration and motion to dismiss motion.	0.10	1295.00	\$129.50
09/09/2021	JAM	NL	Meet with G. Demo, H. Winograd re: motions for arbitration and to dismiss (0.5); tel c. w/ J. Seery, D. Klos re: Dondero compensation (0.5).	1.00	1245.00	\$1,245.00
09/09/2021	GVD	NL	Conference with J. Morris and H. Winograd re response to notes litigation actions	1.00	950.00	\$950.00
09/09/2021	HRW	NL	Review deadlines re: consolidated notes litigations motions to dismiss and motion for stay (0.2).	0.20	695.00	\$139.00
09/13/2021	JNP	NL	Conference with John A. Morris regarding motion to dismiss and motion to compel arbitration.	0.20	1295.00	\$259.00

D-CNL003814

Appx. 02908

Pachulski Stang Ziehl & Jones LLP
 Highland Capital Management LP
 36027 - 00003

Page: 44
 Invoice 128688
 September 30, 2021

				<u>Hours</u>	<u>Rate</u>	<u>Amount</u>
09/13/2021	JNP	NL	Conference with Jordan A. Kroop regarding motion to dismiss and motion to compel arbitration.	0.20	1295.00	\$259.00
09/13/2021	JNP	NL	Review motion to compel arbitration.	0.20	1295.00	\$259.00
09/13/2021	JNP	NL	Conference with Hayley R. Winograd, John A. Morris and Jordan A. Kroop regarding motion to compel arbitration.	0.80	1295.00	\$1,036.00
09/13/2021	JAM	NL	Tel c. w/ J. Pomerantz, J. Kroop, H. Winograd re: defendants' arbitration motion (0.8); e-mail to J. Seery re: motions to dismiss and to arbitrate (0.2); e-mail to J. Pomerantz, J. Kroop re: motions to dismiss and arbitrate (0.1).	1.10	1245.00	\$1,369.50
09/13/2021	HRW	NL	Call with J. Morris, J. Pomerantz, and J. Kroop (0.8).	0.80	695.00	\$556.00
09/13/2021	HRW	NL	Review motion to dismiss in notes litigations (2.0).	2.00	695.00	\$1,390.00
09/13/2021	JAK	NL	Begin review of motion to compel arbitration (0.8); strategy and planning discussion with John Morris, Jeff Pomerantz, and Hayley Winograd (0.8); follow-up discussion with Jeff Pomerantz regarding arbitration motion (0.2); additional review and analysis of arbitration motion (1.1);	2.90	1100.00	\$3,190.00
09/14/2021	IDK	NL	E-mails with attorneys re D Court upholding report and recommendation re HCMFA proceeding, including review of same	0.30	1325.00	\$397.50
09/14/2021	HRW	NL	Review motion to dismiss complaint in notes litigation (2.0).	2.00	695.00	\$1,390.00
09/15/2021	HRW	NL	Research re: motion to dismiss complaint in notes litigation (3.5).	3.50	695.00	\$2,432.50
09/15/2021	HRW	NL	Send opposing counsel supplemental productions in notes litigation (0.2).	0.20	695.00	\$139.00
09/17/2021	GVD	NL	Conference with J. Morris re status of notes litigation	0.10	950.00	\$95.00
09/17/2021	GVD	NL	Conference with H. Winograd re response to motions to dismiss and next steps	0.60	950.00	\$570.00
09/17/2021	HRW	NL	Call with G. Demo re: motion to dismiss in notes litigations (0.6).	0.60	695.00	\$417.00
09/17/2021	HRW	NL	Call with J. Morris re: litigation deadlines (0.1).	0.10	695.00	\$69.50
09/17/2021	HRW	NL	Review and research re: motion to dismiss in notes litigations (3.5).	3.50	695.00	\$2,432.50
09/17/2021	JAK	NL	Review previous pleadings and begin outlining opposition to demand for arbitration;	1.40	1100.00	\$1,540.00

D-CNL003815

Appx. 02909

Pachulski Stang Ziehl & Jones LLP
 Highland Capital Management LP
 36027 - 00003

Page: 45
 Invoice 128688
 September 30, 2021

				<u>Hours</u>	<u>Rate</u>	<u>Amount</u>
09/18/2021	HRW	NL	Draft and research re: motion to dismiss in notes litigations (5.5).	5.50	695.00	\$3,822.50
09/19/2021	JAM	NL	Review of documents and docket and e-mails to J. Kropp, J. Pomerantz, G. Demo, H. Winograd re: facts and arguments concerning opposition to motion to compel arbitration (3.0); further communications w/ J. Kropp re: arbitration motion (0.1).	3.10	1245.00	\$3,859.50
09/19/2021	HRW	NL	Draft and research re: motion to dismiss in notes litigations (8.5).	8.50	695.00	\$5,907.50
09/19/2021	JAK	NL	Email correspondence with John Morris regarding various arguments pertaining to waiver and estoppel for arbitration motion objection; review and analyze transcripts from previous hearing; begin research regarding various arguments for arbitration objection;	3.30	1100.00	\$3,630.00
09/20/2021	IDK	NL	Review of order from District Court on order of reference re DAF action, including E-mail from J Morris re same.	0.20	1325.00	\$265.00
09/20/2021	HRW	NL	Draft opposition to motion to dismiss in notes litigations (13.0).	13.00	695.00	\$9,035.00
09/20/2021	JAK	NL	Drafting of portions of objection to arbitration motion; research legal issues for use in same; emails with John Morris regarding additional arguments and support for same; review and analyze provisions of limited partnership agreement for use in arguments in opposition of arbitration agreement; memo outlining legal issues to be researched and supporting direction;	4.40	1100.00	\$4,840.00
09/21/2021	GVD	NL	Correspondence with team re ability to enforce arbitration in rejected agreement	0.50	950.00	\$475.00
09/21/2021	HRW	NL	Draft opposition to motion to dismiss in notes litigations (9.0).	9.00	695.00	\$6,255.00
09/21/2021	HRW	NL	Review prior discovery R&OS sent to all parties in notes litigations (1.0).	1.00	695.00	\$695.00
09/21/2021	HRW	NL	Draft R&Os for discovery requests in consolidated notes litigation (1.5).	1.50	695.00	\$1,042.50
09/22/2021	JJK	NL	Emails Kroop, Keane on research for opp. to Dondero motion re arbitration; research for inserts.	3.60	995.00	\$3,582.00
09/22/2021	JJK	NL	Research for opp. to motion re: arbitration.	4.80	995.00	\$4,776.00
09/22/2021	JJK	NL	Research for opp. to arbitration motion and emails Kroop on same.	1.40	995.00	\$1,393.00

D-CNL003816

Appx. 02910

Pachulski Stang Ziehl & Jones LLP
 Highland Capital Management LP
 36027 - 00003

Page: 46
 Invoice 128688
 September 30, 2021

				<u>Hours</u>	<u>Rate</u>	<u>Amount</u>
09/22/2021	JAM	NL	Review defendants' discovery demands (0.4); tel c. w. G. Demo re: responses to RFAs (corporate issues) (0.3); tel c. w/ H. Winograd re: document requests and responses (0.7); tel c. w/ G. Demo re: responses to discovery (0.2); e-mails w/ T. Surgent, D. Klos, G. Demo, H. Winograd re: e-mail searches for Nancy Dondero (0.3).	1.90	1245.00	\$2,365.50
09/22/2021	GVD	NL	Conference with J. Morris re discovery issues	0.30	950.00	\$285.00
09/22/2021	GVD	NL	Conference with H. Winograd re response to motion to dismiss	0.20	950.00	\$190.00
09/22/2021	GVD	NL	Draft responses to discovery questions and correspondence with J. Morris re same	0.70	950.00	\$665.00
09/22/2021	GVD	NL	Conference with J. Morris re notes litigation status	0.20	950.00	\$190.00
09/22/2021	HRW	NL	Draft opposition to motion to dismiss in notes litigations (11.0).	11.00	695.00	\$7,645.00
09/22/2021	HRW	NL	Draft R&Os for discovery requests in consolidated notes litigation (2.0).	2.00	695.00	\$1,390.00
09/22/2021	HRW	NL	Call with J. Morris re: discovery requests in consolidated notes litigation (0.7).	0.70	695.00	\$486.50
09/22/2021	JAK	NL	Extensive drafting of opposition to arbitration motion; legal research regarding issues and arguments for same; emails with internal research group regarding issues for researching and related matters;	6.90	1100.00	\$7,590.00
09/23/2021	JJK	NL	Research for opp. to arbitration motion; conf. call Kroop and Keane on same (0.6).	5.80	995.00	\$5,771.00
09/23/2021	JJK	NL	Research for opp. to arbitration motion.	3.10	995.00	\$3,084.50
09/23/2021	JNP	NL	Review of emails from N. Dondero; Conference with John A. Morris regarding same.	0.30	1295.00	\$388.50
09/23/2021	JAM	NL	Tel c. w/ L. Canty re: document review (0.1); tel c. w/ J. Seery re: strategy for responding to motions (0.2); tel c. w/ J. Pomerantz re: strategy for responding to motions (0.1); review documents (3.1).	3.50	1245.00	\$4,357.50
09/23/2021	LSC	NL	Begin preparation of document productions.	2.60	460.00	\$1,196.00
09/23/2021	GVD	NL	Correspondence re research items re arbitration demand	0.10	950.00	\$95.00
09/23/2021	GVD	NL	Conference with J. Morris re notes discovery	0.10	950.00	\$95.00
09/23/2021	GVD	NL	Conference with J. Morris re status of notes litigation and next steps	0.20	950.00	\$190.00

D-CNL003817

Appx. 02911

Pachulski Stang Ziehl & Jones LLP
 Highland Capital Management LP
 36027 - 00003

Page: 47
 Invoice 128688
 September 30, 2021

				<u>Hours</u>	<u>Rate</u>	<u>Amount</u>
09/23/2021	HRW	NL	Gather documents for discovery requests in consolidated notes litigation (1.0).	1.00	695.00	\$695.00
09/23/2021	HRW	NL	Draft opposition to motion to dismiss in notes litigations (12.0).	12.00	695.00	\$8,340.00
09/23/2021	JAK	NL	Review and analyze initial research results on issues pertaining to arbitration opposition from Jonathan Kim and Peter Keane; extensive drafting of arbitration opposition; additional case research and analysis regarding arguments for same; confer with Jonathan Kim and Peter Keane regarding same;	4.90	1100.00	\$5,390.00
09/24/2021	JNP	NL	Conference with Jordan A. Kroop regarding opposition to motion to compel arbitration.	0.30	1295.00	\$388.50
09/24/2021	JAM	NL	Tel c. w/ J. Seery re: opposition to motions (0.3); review documents and begin preparing for depositions (4.1).	4.40	1245.00	\$5,478.00
09/24/2021	GVD	NL	Review discovery responses to notes litigation	0.30	950.00	\$285.00
09/24/2021	HRW	NL	Call with J. Morris and DSI re: discovery requests in consolidated notes litigation (1.0).	1.00	695.00	\$695.00
09/24/2021	HRW	NL	Draft R&Os for discovery requests in consolidated notes litigation (1.5).	1.50	695.00	\$1,042.50
09/24/2021	HRW	NL	Draft opposition to motion to dismiss in notes litigations (9.0).	9.00	695.00	\$6,255.00
09/24/2021	JAK	NL	Continued research and analysis of cases in connection with arbitration opposition; strategy discussion with Jeff Pomerantz regarding same; extensive additional drafting and revision of arbitration opposition;	5.70	1100.00	\$6,270.00
09/25/2021	JAM	NL	Review/revise opposition to motion to dismiss (2.7); tel c. w/ J. Seery re: status and strategy for notes litigation (0.3).	3.00	1245.00	\$3,735.00
09/26/2021	JAM	NL	Communications w/ J. Seery, D. Klos, D. Newman re: responses to discovery (0.2).	0.20	1245.00	\$249.00
09/26/2021	HRW	NL	Draft opposition to motion to dismiss in notes litigations (7.0).	7.00	695.00	\$4,865.00
09/26/2021	JAK	NL	Additional research on issues pertaining to arbitration opposition; additional drafting of opposition; email to Jeff Pomerantz and John Morris regarding same with explanation of approach and related suggestions;	2.30	1100.00	\$2,530.00
09/27/2021	JNP	NL	Review opposition to motion to arbitrate.	0.30	1295.00	\$388.50
09/27/2021	JNP	NL	Conference with John A. Morris regarding opposition to motion to arbitrate.	0.20	1295.00	\$259.00

D-CNL003818

Appx. 02912

Pachulski Stang Ziehl & Jones LLP
 Highland Capital Management LP
 36027 - 00003

Page: 48
 Invoice 128688
 September 30, 2021

				<u>Hours</u>	<u>Rate</u>	<u>Amount</u>
09/27/2021	JNP	NL	Conference with John A. Morris and Jordan A. Kroop regarding response to motion to arbitrate.	0.40	1295.00	\$518.00
09/27/2021	JAM	NL	Review/revise opposition to motion to dismiss (2.5); review/revise written responses to discovery (2.4); e-mails w/ J. Seery, J. Pomerantz, G. Demo, H. Winograd re: written responses to discovery (0.2); tel c. w. J. Seery re: written responses to discovery (0.2); tel c. w/ J. Pomerantz re: oppositions to MTD and arbitration (0.2); tel c. w/ J. Pomerantz, J. Koop re: opposition to motion to compel arbitration (0.4); further revisions to written responses to discovery (0.2); communications w/ J. Seery re: responses to written discovery (0.1).	6.20	1245.00	\$7,719.00
09/27/2021	LSC	NL	Continued preparation of document productions.	9.10	460.00	\$4,186.00
09/27/2021	GVD	NL	Review response to motion to dismiss litigation	0.60	950.00	\$570.00
09/27/2021	HRW	NL	Draft opposition to motion to dismiss in notes litigations (7.5).	7.50	695.00	\$5,212.50
09/27/2021	HRW	NL	Gather production for consolidated notes discovery (1.8).	1.80	695.00	\$1,251.00
09/27/2021	HRW	NL	Draft and review R&Os for discovery requests in consolidated notes litigation (1.5).	1.50	695.00	\$1,042.50
09/27/2021	HRW	NL	Send opposing counsel R&Os in consolidated notes litigation (0.2).	0.20	695.00	\$139.00
09/27/2021	HRW	NL	Send opposing counsel production in consolidated notes litigation (0.1).	0.10	695.00	\$69.50
09/27/2021	JAK	NL	Strategy discussion with John Morris and Jeff Pomerantz regarding opposition to arbitration motion and related matters; extensive additional drafting, research, and review of issues and portions of arbitration motion opposition; work with Greg Demo regarding confirmation-related citations and background for use in opposition; additional drafting and revisions to arbitration opposition;	3.10	1100.00	\$3,410.00
09/28/2021	JNP	NL	Review latest version of opposition to motion to arbitrate and emails regarding same.	0.20	1295.00	\$259.00
09/28/2021	JNP	NL	Review opposition to motion to dismiss.	0.30	1295.00	\$388.50
09/28/2021	JMF	NL	Review responses to motion to dismiss and arbitration.	0.50	1050.00	\$525.00
09/28/2021	JAM	NL	Review/revise draft opposition to motion to compel arbitration (4.8); e-mails w/ J. Seery, J. Pomerantz, J. Koop, G. Demo, H. Winograd re: opposition to motion to compel arbitration (0.4); tel c. w/ J. Seery re: opposition to motion to compel arbitration (0.1);	9.10	1245.00	\$11,329.50

Pachulski Stang Ziehl & Jones LLP
 Highland Capital Management LP
 36027 - 00003

Page: 49
 Invoice 128688
 September 30, 2021

				<u>Hours</u>	<u>Rate</u>	<u>Amount</u>
			tel c. w/ J. Koop re: motion to compel arbitration (0.1); further review and revisions to opposition to motions to dismiss and to compel arbitration (3.2); communications w/ H. Winograd, J. Koop re: oppositions to motion to dismiss and to compel arbitration (0.5).			
09/28/2021	LSC	NL	Prepare draft declaration in support of opposition to Motion to compel Arbitration and Stay Litigation, revise same, and prepare exhibits to same.	0.70	460.00	\$322.00
09/28/2021	GVD	NL	Review motion to dismiss response	1.00	950.00	\$950.00
09/28/2021	HRW	NL	Draft and file opposition to motion to dismiss in notes litigations (8.0).	8.00	695.00	\$5,560.00
09/28/2021	JAK	NL	Extensive revisions, review, and editing of opposition to arbitration motion; edits and review of declaration in support of same; confer over telephone and emails with John Morris and Jeff Pomerantz regarding same; final edits and preparation of opposition for filing and service; supervise filing and service of same, with drafting of cover response per local rules;	6.80	1100.00	\$7,480.00
09/29/2021	JAM	NL	Review documents and written responses to discovery served by all defendants (2.0); e-mail to defense counsel re: deficiencies in written responses to discovery (0.4); e-mail to J. Seery, T. Surgent, D. Klos, J. Pomerantz, G. Demo, H. Winograd re: defendants' deficiencies in discovery (0.4); tel c. J. Seery re: discovery in the notes litigation (0.3).	3.10	1245.00	\$3,859.50
09/29/2021	GVD	NL	Conference with J. Morris re notes litigation discovery	0.20	950.00	\$190.00
09/30/2021	JAM	NL	Tel c. w/ G. Demo, Wilmer re: Waterhouse as a witness and regulatory issues (0.8); e-mail to defense counsel re: discovery issues and depositions (0.6); e-mail to D. Dandeneau, J. Pomerantz, G. Demo re: Waterhouse deposition (0.1)	1.50	1245.00	\$1,867.50
09/30/2021	GVD	NL	Conference with WilmerHale and J. Morris re discovery issues in notes litigation	0.80	950.00	\$760.00
09/30/2021	HRW	NL	Communicate with Robert Half for production re: consolidated notes production (0.2).	0.20	695.00	\$139.00
				269.40		\$235,361.50

████████████████████

████████ █████ █████

██

██

██

████

████████

████████████████

EXHIBIT 180

Pachulski Stang Ziehl & Jones LLP

10100 Santa Monica Blvd.
13th Floor
Los Angeles, CA 90067

Board of Directors
Highland Capital Management LP
300 Crescent Court ste. 700
Dallas, TX 75201

November 05, 2021

Invoice 128811

Client 36027

Matter 00003

JNP

RE: Post-Effective Date

STATEMENT OF PROFESSIONAL SERVICES RENDERED THROUGH 11/05/2021

[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]

Notes Litigation

D-CNL003838
Appx. 02917

Pachulski Stang Ziehl & Jones LLP
 Highland Capital Management LP
 36027 -00003

Page: 93
 Prebill#287690
 November 05, 2021

				<u>Hours</u>	<u>Rate</u>	<u>Amount</u>
Bill						
09/30/2021	CHM	NL	Review documents and run production of consolidated notes litigation search results; email H. Winograd re same.	2.30	750.00	\$1,725.00
JAM	10/01/2021	NL		3.10	3.10	1,245.00
Bill						
10/01/2021	JAM	NL	Review discovery responses and pleadings and prepare Rule 30(b)(6) deposition notices for HCRE, HCMS, and Nexpoint (2.8); communications w/ J. Seery, T. Surgent, D. Klos, J. Pomerantz, G. Demo, H. Winograd re: deposition notices (0.3).	3.10	1245.00	\$3,859.50
HRW	10/01/2021	NL		0.50	0.50	695.00
Bill						
10/01/2021	HRW	NL	Communicate with Robert Half for production re: consolidated notes production (0.5).	0.50	695.00	\$347.50
HRW	10/01/2021	NL		0.50	0.50	695.00
Bill						
10/01/2021	HRW	NL	Oversee and review production re: re: consolidated notes production (0.5).	0.50	695.00	\$347.50
JAM	10/02/2021	NL		2.60	2.60	1,245.00
Bill						
10/02/2021	JAM	NL	Tel c. w/ G. Demo re: discovery, strategy (0.4); draft deposition notices for J. Dondero, N. Dondero, F. Waterhouse, Dugaboy, and HCMFA (2.1); e-mails w/ J. Pomerantz, G. Demo, H. Winograd, Z. Annable re: deposition notices (0.1).	2.60	1245.00	\$3,237.00
GVD	10/02/2021	NL		0.40	0.40	950.00
Bill						
10/02/2021	GVD	NL	Conference with J. Morris about notes litigation discovery issues	0.40	950.00	\$380.00
GVD	10/02/2021	NL		0.50	0.50	950.00
Bill						
10/02/2021	GVD	NL	Review deposition notices	0.50	950.00	\$475.00
JAM	10/03/2021	NL		3.90	3.90	1,245.00
Bill						
10/03/2021	JAM	NL	Prepare deposition notices for HCRE, HCMS,	3.90	1245.00	\$4,855.50

Pachulski Stang Ziehl & Jones LLP
 Highland Capital Management LP
 36027 -00003

Page: 94
 Prebill#287690
 November 05, 2021

					<u>Hours</u>	<u>Rate</u>	<u>Amount</u>
			NexPoint and subpoena for DC Sauter, and revise deposition notices for F. Waterhouse and HCMFA (3.6); e-mails w/ J. Seery, T. Surgent, D. Klos, J. Pomerantz, G. Demo, H. Winograd re: deposition notices (0.2); tel c. w/ J. Seery, G. Demo re: deposition notices (0.1).				
GVD Bill	10/03/2021	NL	0.30	0.30	950.00		285.00
10/03/2021	GVD	NL	Review discovery requests and correspondence re same			0.30	950.00 \$285.00
HRW Bill	10/03/2021	NL	1.00	1.00	695.00		695.00
10/03/2021	HRW	NL	Review and edit deposition notices for notes litigation (1.0).			1.00	695.00 \$695.00
JAM Bill	10/04/2021	NL	1.80	1.80	1,245.00		2,241.00
10/04/2021	JAM	NL	Review/revise/finalize deposition notices, subpoenas, and notices of subpoenas (1.1); e-mail to defense counsel, J. Pomerantz, G. Demo, H. Winograd, Z. Annable re: deposition notices, subpoenas, notices of subpoena and related matters (0.3); e-mail to Z. Annable, J. Pomerantz, G. Demo, H. Winograd re: service of the deposition notices and subpoenas (0.1); tel c. w/ J. Seery re: status, discovery (0.3).			1.80	1245.00 \$2,241.00
HRW Bill	10/04/2021	NL	0.50	0.50	695.00		347.50
10/04/2021	HRW	NL	Review production re: consolidated notes production (0.5).			0.50	695.00 \$347.50
HRW Bill	10/04/2021	NL	0.20	0.20	695.00		139.00
10/04/2021	HRW	NL	Communicate with Robert Half re: production for Employee Claims (0.2).			0.20	695.00 \$139.00
JAM Bill	10/05/2021	NL	1.70	1.70	1,245.00		2,116.50
10/05/2021	JAM	NL	Tel c. w/ H. Winograd re: discovery, Aigen e-mail (0.5); tel c. w/ D. Rukavina re: discovery (0.3); tel c. w/ J. Seery re: discovery, status (0.5); e-mails w/ D. Rukavina, D. Deitsch-Perez re: discovery,			1.70	1245.00 \$2,116.50

Pachulski Stang Ziehl & Jones LLP
 Highland Capital Management LP
 36027 -00003

Page: 95
 Prebill#287690
 November 05, 2021

					<u>Hours</u>	<u>Rate</u>	<u>Amount</u>
			depositions (0.4).				
GVD	10/05/2021	NL		0.30	0.30	950.00	285.00
Bill							
10/05/2021	GVD	NL	Correspondence with Quinn re notes litigation		0.30	950.00	\$285.00
HRW	10/05/2021	NL		0.50	0.50	695.00	347.50
Bill							
10/05/2021	HRW	NL	Call with J. Morris re: discovery issues in notes litigation (0.5).		0.50	695.00	\$347.50
HRW	10/05/2021	NL		0.30	0.30	695.00	208.50
Bill							
10/05/2021	HRW	NL	Review discovery issues in notes litigation (0.3).		0.30	695.00	\$208.50
JAM	10/06/2021	NL		1.60	1.60	1,245.00	1,992.00
Bill							
10/06/2021	JAM	NL	E-mail to D. Deitz-Perez, D. Rukavina re: discovery (0.3); e-mail to D. Dandeneau re: Waterhouse deposition (0.1); e-mail to M. Aigen re: discovery issues (0.3); e-mail to defense counsel re: response to various discovery issues (0.9).		1.60	1245.00	\$1,992.00
LSC	10/06/2021	NL		2.10	2.10	460.00	966.00
Bill							
10/06/2021	LSC	NL	Research, correspondence, and review of discovery.		2.10	460.00	\$966.00
GVD	10/06/2021	NL		0.20	0.20	950.00	190.00
Bill							
10/06/2021	GVD	NL	Correspondence with litigation trustee re outstanding notes		0.20	950.00	\$190.00
HRW	10/06/2021	NL		0.80	0.80	695.00	556.00
Bill							
10/06/2021	HRW	NL	Review responses and production re: discovery requests in notes litigation (0.8).		0.80	695.00	\$556.00
HRW	10/06/2021	NL		0.50	0.50	695.00	347.50
Bill							
10/06/2021	HRW	NL	Respond to J. Morris email re: discovery issues in notes litigation (0.5).		0.50	695.00	\$347.50
HRW	10/06/2021	NL		0.20	0.20	695.00	139.00

Pachulski Stang Ziehl & Jones LLP
 Highland Capital Management LP
 36027 -00003

Page: 96
 Prebill#287690
 November 05, 2021

				<u>Hours</u>	<u>Rate</u>	<u>Amount</u>	
Bill							
10/06/2021	HRW	NL	Review emails regarding 30(b)(6) deposition issues and scheduling (0.2).	0.20	695.00	\$139.00	
HRW Bill	10/06/2021		NL	0.10	0.10	695.00	69.50
10/06/2021	HRW	NL	Send opposing counsel supplemental notes litigation production (0.1).	0.10	695.00	\$69.50	
HRW Bill	10/06/2021		NL	0.80	0.80	695.00	556.00
10/06/2021	HRW	NL	Prepare supplemental production for notes litigation (0.8).	0.80	695.00	\$556.00	
JAM Bill	10/07/2021		NL	0.40	0.40	1,245.00	498.00
10/07/2021	JAM	NL	Review/revise e-mail to defense counsel re: discovery (0.4).	0.40	1245.00	\$498.00	
LSC Bill	10/07/2021		NL	2.30	2.30	460.00	1,058.00
10/07/2021	LSC	NL	Research, correspondence, and review of discovery.	2.30	460.00	\$1,058.00	
GVD Bill	10/07/2021		NL	0.20	0.20	950.00	190.00
10/07/2021	GVD	NL	Correspondence with Quinn re notes collection issues	0.20	950.00	\$190.00	
HRW Bill	10/07/2021		NL	0.10	0.10	695.00	69.50
10/07/2021	HRW	NL	Email J. Morris re: discovery issues in notes litigation (0.1).	0.10	695.00	\$69.50	
HRW Bill	10/07/2021		NL	0.10	0.10	695.00	69.50
10/07/2021	HRW	NL	Email DSI re: re: discovery issues in notes litigation (0.1).	0.10	695.00	\$69.50	
JAM Bill	10/08/2021		NL	2.70	2.70	1,245.00	3,361.50
10/08/2021	JAM	NL	Analyze NexPoint’s Rule 30(b)(6) deposition notice and e-mail to J. Seery, T. Sargent, J. Pomerantz, G.	2.70	1245.00	\$3,361.50	

Pachulski Stang Ziehl & Jones LLP
 Highland Capital Management LP
 36027 -00003

Page: 97
 Prebill#287690
 November 05, 2021

					<u>Hours</u>	<u>Rate</u>	<u>Amount</u>
			Demo, H. Winograd re: same (1.4); e-mails to J. Seery, T. Surgent, D. Rukavina, H. Winograd re: objections to NexPoint's Rule 30(b)(6) deposition notice (0.4); revise deposition notices for J. Dondero, HCRE, HCMS, and NexPoint (0.2); e-mails w/ Z. Annable, H. Winograd re: revised deposition notices for J. Dondero, HCRE, HCMS, and NexPoint (0.1); e-mails w/ D. Klos, T. Surgent, H. Winograd re: documents and information concerning J. Dondero compensation, loan history (0.4); review defendants' document production (0.2).				
HRW Bill	10/08/2021	NL		0.10	0.10	695.00	69.50
10/08/2021	HRW	NL	Review 30(b)(6) notices for consolidated notes litigation (0.1).		0.10	695.00	\$69.50
HRW Bill	10/08/2021	NL		0.30	0.30	695.00	208.50
10/08/2021	HRW	NL	Review DSI email and production re: Dondero compensation (0.3).		0.30	695.00	\$208.50
HRW Bill	10/08/2021	NL		0.20	0.20	695.00	139.00
10/08/2021	HRW	NL	Review production from defendants in consolidated notes litigation (0.2).		0.20	695.00	\$139.00
JAM Bill	10/09/2021	NL		5.90	5.90	1,245.00	7,345.50
10/09/2021	JAM	NL	E-mails to TSG re: depositions (0.3); e-mail to H. Winograd re: additional document production (0.1); e-mails w/ D. Klos, T. Surgent, H. Winograd re: Dondero loans and payment history (0.2); e-mails w/ J. Seery, D. Klos re: cost/value of portfolio companies (0.1); begin Nancy Dondero deposition outline (2.3); tel c. w/ J. Seery re: notes litigation (0.2); review documents/transcripts (2.7).		5.90	1245.00	\$7,345.50
JAM Bill	10/10/2021	NL		2.10	2.10	1,245.00	2,614.50
10/10/2021	JAM	NL	Analyze Rule 30(b)(6) Notice of Dondero, HCRE and HCMS and prepare draft objections (1.8); tel c. w/ J. Seery re: litigation matters (0.3).		2.10	1245.00	\$2,614.50
JAM	10/11/2021	NL		0.40	0.40	1,245.00	498.00

Pachulski Stang Ziehl & Jones LLP
 Highland Capital Management LP
 36027 -00003

Page: 98
 Prebill#287690
 November 05, 2021

				<u>Hours</u>	<u>Rate</u>	<u>Amount</u>	
Bill							
10/11/2021	JAM	NL	E-mails w/ D. Rukavina, D. Deitz-Perez re: depositions (0.2); e-mails w/ D. Klos, T. Conouyer re: Waterhouse roles (0.1); e-mails w/ H. Winograd, L. Canty re: supplemental document production (0.1).	0.40	1245.00	\$498.00	
LSC Bill	10/11/2021	NL		0.50	0.50	460.00	230.00
10/11/2021	LSC	NL	Retrieve and review Dondero's supplemental production.	0.50	460.00	\$230.00	
HRW Bill	10/11/2021	NL		0.10	0.10	695.00	69.50
10/11/2021	HRW	NL	Review email from counsel re: deposition schedule in consolidated notes litigation (0.1).	0.10	695.00	\$69.50	
HRW Bill	10/11/2021	NL		0.50	0.50	695.00	347.50
10/11/2021	HRW	NL	Review supplemental production in consolidated notes litigation (0.5).	0.50	695.00	\$347.50	
JAM Bill	10/12/2021	NL		4.60	4.60	1,245.00	5,727.00
10/12/2021	JAM	NL	E-mails w/ defense counsel re: discovery (0.3); e-mails w/ D. Klos, L. Canty, H. Winograd re: supplemental document production (0.5); prepare for depositions (3.4); e-mails w/ defense counsel re: depositions (0.2); tel c. w/ J. Seery, D. Klos re: obligors' payments on Notes (0.2).	4.60	1245.00	\$5,727.00	
LSC Bill	10/12/2021	NL		4.20	4.20	460.00	1,932.00
10/12/2021	LSC	NL	Preparation of supplemental productions (2), including redactions to same and correspondence regarding the same.	4.20	460.00	\$1,932.00	
LSC Bill	10/12/2021	NL		0.50	0.50	460.00	230.00
10/12/2021	LSC	NL	Coordinate and assist with retrieval and preparation of documents with respect to notes litigation for J. Morris.	0.50	460.00	\$230.00	
HRW	10/12/2021	NL		1.80	1.80	695.00	1,251.00

Pachulski Stang Ziehl & Jones LLP
 Highland Capital Management LP
 36027 -00003

Page: 99
 Prebill#287690
 November 05, 2021

				<u>Hours</u>	<u>Rate</u>	<u>Amount</u>
Bill						
10/12/2021	HRW	NL	Review supplemental production for consolidated notes litigation (1.8).	1.80	695.00	\$1,251.00
HRW Bill	10/12/2021	NL	0.20	0.20	695.00	139.00
10/12/2021	HRW	NL	Send counsel supplemental production for consolidated notes litigation (0.2).	0.20	695.00	\$139.00
HRW Bill	10/12/2021	NL	0.50	0.50	695.00	347.50
10/12/2021	HRW	NL	Call with DSI re: backup documentation for demonstrative chart showing Trussway, MGM, Cornerstone valuations in consolidated notes litigation (0.5).	0.50	695.00	\$347.50
HRW Bill	10/12/2021	NL	0.20	0.20	695.00	139.00
10/12/2021	HRW	NL	Email J. Morris, G. Demo, J. Pomerantz, and client re: backup documentation for demonstrative chart showing Trussway, MGM, Cornerstone valuations in consolidated notes litigation (0.2).	0.20	695.00	\$139.00
HRW Bill	10/12/2021	NL	0.20	0.20	695.00	139.00
10/12/2021	HRW	NL	Email J. Morris re: supplemental productions for consolidated notes litigations (0.2).	0.20	695.00	\$139.00
JAM Bill	10/13/2021	NL	6.80	6.80	1,245.00	8,466.00
10/13/2021	JAM	NL	Prepare for meeting with J. Seery concerning depositions, including analysis of issues concerning NexPoint (1.2); e-mails to J. Seery, T. Surgent, D. Klos re: deposition preparation (0.3); tel c. w/ J. Seery, D. Klos, T. Surgent, G. Demo, H, Winograd re: preparation for depositions (1.5); letters to defense counsel re: documents (0.2); prepare for depositions (3.6).	6.80	1245.00	\$8,466.00
GVD Bill	10/13/2021	NL	1.60	1.60	950.00	1,520.00
10/13/2021	GVD	NL	Conference with J. Seery, D. Klos and PSZJ re preparation for depositions	1.60	950.00	\$1,520.00

Pachulski Stang Ziehl & Jones LLP
 Highland Capital Management LP
 36027 -00003

Page: 100
 Prebill#287690
 November 05, 2021

					<u>Hours</u>	<u>Rate</u>	<u>Amount</u>
GVD Bill	10/13/2021	NL	0.30	0.30	950.00		285.00
10/13/2021	GVD	NL	Conference with J. Morris re status of notes litigation and next steps		0.30	950.00	\$285.00
GVD Bill	10/13/2021	NL	0.10	0.10	950.00		95.00
10/13/2021	GVD	NL	Review transcripts re notes litigation issues		0.10	950.00	\$95.00
HRW Bill	10/13/2021	NL	1.50	1.50	695.00		1,042.50
10/13/2021	HRW	NL	Review defendants' R&Os to Highland's discovery requests in notes litigations (1.5).		1.50	695.00	\$1,042.50
HRW Bill	10/13/2021	NL	0.20	0.20	695.00		139.00
10/13/2021	HRW	NL	Email J. Morris re: defendants' R&Os to Highland's discovery requests in notes litigations (0.2).		0.20	695.00	\$139.00
HRW Bill	10/13/2021	NL	1.20	1.20	695.00		834.00
10/13/2021	HRW	NL	Call with J. Seery and D. Klos re: deposition prep for notes litigation (1.2).		1.20	695.00	\$834.00
HRW Bill	10/13/2021	NL	1.00	1.00	695.00		695.00
10/13/2021	HRW	NL	Prepare for call with J. Seery and D. Klos re: deposition prep for notes litigation (1.0).		1.00	695.00	\$695.00
HRW Bill	10/13/2021	NL	0.10	0.10	695.00		69.50
10/13/2021	HRW	NL	Email J. Morris re: supplemental production in notes litigation (0.1).		0.10	695.00	\$69.50
HRW Bill	10/13/2021	NL	0.20	0.20	695.00		139.00
10/13/2021	HRW	NL	Send opposing counsel supplemental production in notes litigation (0.2).		0.20	695.00	\$139.00

Pachulski Stang Ziehl & Jones LLP
 Highland Capital Management LP
 36027 -00003

Page: 101
 Prebill#287690
 November 05, 2021

					<u>Hours</u>	<u>Rate</u>	<u>Amount</u>
LSC Bill	10/14/2021	NL	5.90	5.90	460.00		2,714.00
10/14/2021	LSC	NL	Assist with research, retrieval, and review of discovery documents in connection with upcoming depositions.		5.90	460.00	\$2,714.00
LSC Bill	10/14/2021	NL	0.50	0.50	460.00		230.00
10/14/2021	LSC	NL	Research and correspondence regarding certain management documents for J. Morris.		0.50	460.00	\$230.00
JNP Bill	10/15/2021	NL	0.20	0.20	1,295.00		259.00
10/15/2021	JNP	NL	Conference with John A. Morris regarding upcoming depositions and issues relating to notes litigation including hearing coverage.		0.20	1295.00	\$259.00
JNP Bill	10/15/2021	NL	0.10	0.10	1,295.00		129.50
10/15/2021	JNP	NL	Review emails regarding notes depositions and discovery.		0.10	1295.00	\$129.50
JAM Bill	10/15/2021	NL	6.80	6.80	1,245.00		8,466.00
10/15/2021	JAM	NL	Tel c. w/ J. Seery, D. Klos, G. Demo, H. Winograd re: preparation for depositions (1.7); tel c. w/ H. Winograd, L. Canty re: depositions, exhibits, and related matters (0.2); prepare for depositions (3.1); e-mails to L. Canty, H. Winograd re: deposition exhibits (0.4); tel c. w/ G. Demo re: depositions (0.2); tel c. w/ J. Pomerantz re: notes litigation (0.3); e-mail to J. Seery, D. Klos re: prior court filings (0.5); e-mail to J. Seery, D. Klos, H. Winograd re: LP Agreement (0.3); e-mail to J. Seery, D. Klos, H. Winograd re: management representation letters (0.1).		6.80	1245.00	\$8,466.00
LSC Bill	10/15/2021	NL	3.10	3.10	460.00		1,426.00
10/15/2021	LSC	NL	Research, retrieve, and review documents in connection with Notes Litigation and correspondence regarding the same (2.6); research and correspondence regarding prior productions (.5).		3.10	460.00	\$1,426.00
GVD	10/15/2021	NL	1.60	1.60	950.00		1,520.00

Pachulski Stang Ziehl & Jones LLP
 Highland Capital Management LP
 36027 -00003

Page: 102
 Prebill#287690
 November 05, 2021

				<u>Hours</u>	<u>Rate</u>	<u>Amount</u>
Bill						
10/15/2021	GVD	NL	Attend conference re preparation for notes litigation	1.60	950.00	\$1,520.00
HRW	10/15/2021	NL		1.50	1.50	695.00
Bill						1,042.50
10/15/2021	HRW	NL	Review productions from Highland to defendants in notes litigations (1.5).	1.50	695.00	\$1,042.50
HRW	10/15/2021	NL		0.40	0.40	695.00
Bill						278.00
10/15/2021	HRW	NL	Communicate with L. Canty re: productions from Highland to defendants in notes litigations (0.4).	0.40	695.00	\$278.00
HRW	10/15/2021	NL		1.60	1.60	695.00
Bill						1,112.00
10/15/2021	HRW	NL	Call with J. Morris, G. Demo, J. Seery, D. Klos re: deposition prep for notes litigation (1.6).	1.60	695.00	\$1,112.00
HRW	10/15/2021	NL		0.20	0.20	695.00
Bill						139.00
10/15/2021	HRW	NL	Call with J. Morris and L. Canty re: deposition prep for notes litigation (0.2).	0.20	695.00	\$139.00
JAM	10/16/2021	NL		7.80	7.80	1,245.00
Bill						9,711.00
10/16/2021	JAM	NL	Prepare for depositions (7.5); e-mail to HCMLP, PSZJ re: Deposition Outline for Nancy Dondero (0.1); e-mail to L. Canty, H. Winograd re: deposition exhibits (0.1); tel c. w/ H. Winograd re: document production (0.1).	7.80	1245.00	\$9,711.00
LSC	10/16/2021	NL		8.50	8.50	460.00
Bill						3,910.00
10/16/2021	LSC	NL	Preparation of exhibits in connection with upcoming depositions and research discovery documents regarding the same (4.9); preparation of materials in connection with hearing on motions to dismiss, including legal research regarding the same (3.6)	8.50	460.00	\$3,910.00
HRW	10/16/2021	NL		3.80	3.80	695.00
Bill						2,641.00
10/16/2021	HRW	NL	Review supplemental HCMFA production for notes litigation (3.8).	3.80	695.00	\$2,641.00

Pachulski Stang Ziehl & Jones LLP
 Highland Capital Management LP
 36027 -00003

Page: 103
 Prebill#287690
 November 05, 2021

					<u>Hours</u>	<u>Rate</u>	<u>Amount</u>
HRW Bill	10/16/2021	NL	0.40	0.40	695.00		278.00
10/16/2021	HRW	NL	Communicate with L. Canty re: supplemental HCMFA production for notes litigation (0.4).		0.40	695.00	\$278.00
HRW Bill	10/16/2021	NL	0.20	0.20	695.00		139.00
10/16/2021	HRW	NL	Email with C. Mackle re: supplemental HCMFA production for notes litigation (0.2).		0.20	695.00	\$139.00
JNP Bill	10/17/2021	NL	0.10	0.10	1,295.00		129.50
10/17/2021	JNP	NL	Review emails regarding depositions.		0.10	1295.00	\$129.50
JAM Bill	10/17/2021	NL	11.00	11.00	1,245.00		13,695.00
10/17/2021	JAM	NL	Prepare for depositions (9.2); multiple calls with J. Seery re: depositions, facts and strategy for Notes Litigation (1.2); e-mails w H. Winograd, L. Canty re: exhibits (0.3); e-mails w/ defense counsel, court reporter re: depositions (0.3).		11.00	1245.00	\$13,695.00
LSC Bill	10/17/2021	NL	2.00	2.00	460.00		920.00
10/17/2021	LSC	NL	Preparation of exhibits in connection with upcoming depositions and research discovery documents regarding the same.		2.00	460.00	\$920.00
HRW Bill	10/17/2021	NL	8.00	8.00	695.00		5,560.00
10/17/2021	HRW	NL	Review supplemental HCMFA production for notes litigation (8.0).		8.00	695.00	\$5,560.00
HRW Bill	10/17/2021	NL	0.80	0.80	695.00		556.00
10/17/2021	HRW	NL	Review emails from J. Morris and DSI re: hot documents for depositions in notes litigation (0.8).		0.80	695.00	\$556.00
HRW Bill	10/17/2021	NL	0.20	0.20	695.00		139.00
10/17/2021	HRW	NL	Send email to J. Morris re: document productions from Highland to defendants in notes litigations		0.20	695.00	\$139.00

Pachulski Stang Ziehl & Jones LLP
 Highland Capital Management LP
 36027 -00003

Page: 104
 Prebill#287690
 November 05, 2021

					<u>Hours</u>	<u>Rate</u>	<u>Amount</u>
			(0.2).				
JNP Bill	10/18/2021	NL	1.00	1.00	1,295.00		1,295.00
10/18/2021	JNP	NL	Review motion to dismiss and opposition regarding notes litigation.		1.00	1295.00	\$1,295.00
JNP Bill	10/18/2021	NL	0.90	0.90	1,295.00		1,165.50
10/18/2021	JNP	NL	Conference with John A. Morris and then J. Seery regarding Nancy Dondero deposition.		0.90	1295.00	\$1,165.50
JAM Bill	10/18/2021	NL	13.90	13.90	1,245.00		17,305.50
10/18/2021	JAM	NL	Prepare for depositions (5.8); tel c. w/ G. Demo re: depositions (0.2); Nancy Dondero deposition (7.0); tel c. w/ J. Seery (partial), J. Pomerantz re: Nancy Dondero deposition (0.8); tel c. w/ D. Newman re: Nancy Dondero deposition (0.1).		13.90	1245.00	\$17,305.50
LSC Bill	10/18/2021	NL	7.90	7.90	460.00		3,634.00
10/18/2021	LSC	NL	Prepare for and assist at deposition of Susan Dondero.		7.90	460.00	\$3,634.00
GVD Bill	10/18/2021	NL	0.10	0.10	950.00		95.00
10/18/2021	GVD	NL	Correspondence with L. Canty re deposition issues		0.10	950.00	\$95.00
GVD Bill	10/18/2021	NL	0.20	0.20	950.00		190.00
10/18/2021	GVD	NL	Conference with J. Morris re notes litigation strategy		0.20	950.00	\$190.00
GVD Bill	10/18/2021	NL	4.50	4.50	950.00		4,275.00
10/18/2021	GVD	NL	Attend deposition of N. Dondero (partial)		4.50	950.00	\$4,275.00
GVD Bill	10/18/2021	NL	0.20	0.20	950.00		190.00
10/18/2021	GVD	NL	Review WilmerHale analysis of Investment Company Act issues		0.20	950.00	\$190.00
HRW	10/18/2021	NL	3.50	3.50	695.00		2,432.50

Pachulski Stang Ziehl & Jones LLP
 Highland Capital Management LP
 36027 -00003

Page: 105
 Prebill#287690
 November 05, 2021

				<u>Hours</u>	<u>Rate</u>	<u>Amount</u>
Bill						
10/18/2021	HRW	NL	Review supplemental HCMFA production for notes litigation (3.5).	3.50	695.00	\$2,432.50
HRW Bill	10/18/2021	NL	6.00	6.00	695.00	4,170.00
10/18/2021	HRW	NL	Deposition of Nancy Dondero for notes litigation (6.0).	6.00	695.00	\$4,170.00
HRW Bill	10/18/2021	NL	0.50	0.50	695.00	347.50
10/18/2021	HRW	NL	Review Waterhouse deposition outline (0.5).	0.50	695.00	\$347.50
JNP Bill	10/19/2021	NL	1.40	1.40	1,295.00	1,813.00
10/19/2021	JNP	NL	Continue to prepare for hearing on motion to dismiss.	1.40	1295.00	\$1,813.00
JNP Bill	10/19/2021	NL	0.10	0.10	1,295.00	129.50
10/19/2021	JNP	NL	Review and respond to email regarding use of Dondero plan proposal in course of litigation.	0.10	1295.00	\$129.50
JAM Bill	10/19/2021	NL	14.60	14.60	1,245.00	18,177.00
10/19/2021	JAM	NL	Prepare for Waterhouse deposition (3.6); Waterhouse deposition (including multiple calls with G. Demo and/or H. Winograd) (10.2); tel c. w/ J. Seery re: Waterhouse deposition (0.1); tel c. w/ G. Demo, H. Winograd re: Waterhouse deposition (0.3); tel c. w/ J. Seery re: status, strategy (0.4).	14.60	1245.00	\$18,177.00
LSC Bill	10/19/2021	NL	11.30	11.30	460.00	5,198.00
10/19/2021	LSC	NL	Prepare for and assist at deposition of Frank Waterhouse.	11.30	460.00	\$5,198.00
GVD Bill	10/19/2021	NL	0.20	0.20	950.00	190.00
10/19/2021	GVD	NL	Conference with J. Seery re issues re Dondero deposition	0.20	950.00	\$190.00
GVD	10/19/2021	NL	1.10	1.10	950.00	1,045.00

Pachulski Stang Ziehl & Jones LLP
 Highland Capital Management LP
 36027 -00003

Page: 106
 Prebill#287690
 November 05, 2021

				Hours	Rate	Amount
Bill						
10/19/2021	GVD	NL	Review issues re application of mediation privilege	1.10	950.00	\$1,045.00
GVD Bill	10/19/2021	NL	0.600.60	950.00		570.00
10/19/2021	GVD	NL	Multiple conferences with H. Winograd and J. Morris re status of Waterhouse deposition	0.60	950.00	\$570.00
GVD Bill	10/19/2021	NL	4.604.60	950.00		4,370.00
10/19/2021	GVD	NL	Attend Waterhouse deposition (partial)	4.60	950.00	\$4,370.00
HRW Bill	10/19/2021	NL	9.509.50	695.00		6,602.50
10/19/2021	HRW	NL	Deposition of Frank Waterhouse for notes litigation (9.5).	9.50	695.00	\$6,602.50
HRW Bill	10/19/2021	NL	1.501.50	695.00		1,042.50
10/19/2021	HRW	NL	Review Waterhouse deposition outline (1.5).	1.50	695.00	\$1,042.50
HRW Bill	10/19/2021	NL	1.801.80	695.00		1,251.00
10/19/2021	HRW	NL	Review supplemental HCMFA production for notes litigation (1.8).	1.80	695.00	\$1,251.00
HRW Bill	10/19/2021	NL	0.500.50	695.00		347.50
10/19/2021	HRW	NL	Calls with G. Demo and J. Morris re: Waterhouse deposition (0.5).	0.50	695.00	\$347.50
HRW Bill	10/19/2021	NL	0.100.10	695.00		69.50
10/19/2021	HRW	NL	Call with J. Morris re: Waterhouse deposition (0.1).	0.10	695.00	\$69.50
HRW Bill	10/19/2021	NL	0.300.30	695.00		208.50
10/19/2021	HRW	NL	Email with G. Demo and J. Elkin re: mediation privilege (0.3).	0.30	695.00	\$208.50

Pachulski Stang Ziehl & Jones LLP
 Highland Capital Management LP
 36027 -00003

Page: 107
 Prebill#287690
 November 05, 2021

					<u>Hours</u>	<u>Rate</u>	<u>Amount</u>
HRW Bill	10/19/2021	NL	0.30	0.30	695.00		208.50
10/19/2021	HRW	NL	Research issue of FRE 408 and use of documents from mediation (0.3).		0.30	695.00	\$208.50
JAM Bill	10/20/2021	NL	6.80	6.80	1,245.00		8,466.00
10/20/2021	JAM	NL	Prepare for Dondero deposition (4.2); e-mails w/ L. Canty re: exhibits for Dondero deposition (0.2); Dondero deposition (cancelled) (0.2); tel c. w/ J. Seery re: notes litigation (0.3); e-mails w/ court reporter re: Seery deposition (0.1); e-mails w/ D. Rukavina, H. Winograd re: discovery (0.6); tel c. w/ J. Seery re: notes litigation (0.5); tel c. w/ G. Demo re: notes litigation (0.1); tel c. w/ D. Klos, K. Hendrix re: depositions in notes litigation (0.2); tel c. w/ J. Seery re: notes litigation (0.3); tel c. w/ B. Sharp re: forensic analysis of notes (0.1).		6.80	1245.00	\$8,466.00
LSC Bill	10/20/2021	NL	1.90	1.90	460.00		874.00
10/20/2021	LSC	NL	Prepare for anticipated Dondero and related entities deposition (ultimately canceled).		1.90	460.00	\$874.00
GVD Bill	10/20/2021	NL	0.10	0.10	950.00		95.00
10/20/2021	GVD	NL	Correspondence with J. Pomerantz re mediation issues		0.10	950.00	\$95.00
GVD Bill	10/20/2021	NL	0.10	0.10	950.00		95.00
10/20/2021	GVD	NL	Correspondence with H. Winograd re HCMFA notes litigation		0.10	950.00	\$95.00
HRW Bill	10/20/2021	NL	0.30	0.30	695.00		208.50
10/20/2021	HRW	NL	Review HCMFA discovery in notes litigation (0.3).		0.30	695.00	\$208.50
HRW Bill	10/20/2021	NL	0.10	0.10	695.00		69.50
10/20/2021	HRW	NL	Email G. Demo re: HCMFA adversary proceeding (0.1).		0.10	695.00	\$69.50
HRW	10/20/2021	NL	0.10	0.10	695.00		69.50

Pachulski Stang Ziehl & Jones LLP
 Highland Capital Management LP
 36027 -00003

Page: 108
 Prebill#287690
 November 05, 2021

				<u>Hours</u>	<u>Rate</u>	<u>Amount</u>
Bill						
10/20/2021	HRW	NL	Email J. Morris re: HCMFA supplemental discovery in notes litigation (0.1).	0.10	695.00	\$69.50
HRW	10/20/2021	NL		0.10	0.10	695.00
Bill						69.50
10/20/2021	HRW	NL	Review email from J. Morris re: document requests to HCMFA in notes litigation (0.1).	0.10	695.00	\$69.50
HRW	10/20/2021	NL		0.10	0.10	695.00
Bill						69.50
10/20/2021	HRW	NL	Review email from HCMFA counsel re: Highland's document requests to HCMFA in notes litigation (0.1).	0.10	695.00	\$69.50
JNP	10/21/2021	NL		0.70	0.70	1,295.00
Bill						906.50
10/21/2021	JNP	NL	Continue to prepare for motion to dismiss hearing.	0.70	1295.00	\$906.50
JAM	10/21/2021	NL		8.30	8.30	1,245.00
Bill						10,333.50
10/21/2021	JAM	NL	E-mail to J. Vaughn, J. Seery, B. Sharp re: metadata for promissory notes (0.2); meet w/ J. Seery to prepare for deposition (0.8); review audited financials concerning "practice of forgivable loans" (0.6); tel c. w/ J. Seery, D. Klos re: "practice of forgivable loans" (0.1); prepare for J. Seery deposition (1.6); Seery deposition (4.8); tel c. w/ J. Pomerantz re: Seery deposition (0.2).	8.30	1245.00	\$10,333.50
GVD	10/21/2021	NL		2.10	2.10	950.00
Bill						1,995.00
10/21/2021	GVD	NL	Attend J. Seery deposition (partial)	2.10	950.00	\$1,995.00
HRW	10/21/2021	NL		3.00	3.00	695.00
Bill						2,085.00
10/21/2021	HRW	NL	Deposition of Jim Seery for notes litigation (3.0).	3.00	695.00	\$2,085.00
HRW	10/21/2021	NL		0.10	0.10	695.00
Bill						69.50
10/21/2021	HRW	NL	Email J. Pomerantz re: notes litigation MTD (0.1).	0.10	695.00	\$69.50
HRW	10/21/2021	NL		0.20	0.20	695.00
						139.00

Pachulski Stang Ziehl & Jones LLP
 Highland Capital Management LP
 36027 -00003

Page: 109
 Prebill#287690
 November 05, 2021

				<u>Hours</u>	<u>Rate</u>	<u>Amount</u>
Bill						
10/21/2021	HRW	NL	Review notes litigation MTD (0.2).	0.20	695.00	\$139.00
HRW	10/21/2021	NL	0.10	0.10	695.00	69.50
Bill						
10/21/2021	HRW	NL	Review J. Morris email re: legal research for MSJ and notes litigation (0.1).	0.10	695.00	\$69.50
JAM	10/22/2021	NL	3.70	3.70	1,245.00	4,606.50
Bill						
10/22/2021	JAM	NL	E-mail to D. Dandeneau re: Waterhouse transcript (0.2); e-mails w/ D. Klos re: proof of payment on loans (0.3); tel c. w/ J. Seery re: Seery deposition (0.2); e-mails w/ J. Vaughn, T. Surgent, G. Demo, H. Winograd re: metadata for the notes (0.4); tel c. w/ J. Vaughn, T. Surgent re: metadata for the notes (0.3); prepare for depositions (1.7); e-mail to L. Canty re: proof of payment document production (0.2); tel c. w/ J. Seery re: notes litigation (0.2); tel c. w/ J. Seery re: notes litigation (0.2).	3.70	1245.00	\$4,606.50
GVD	10/22/2021	NL	0.50	0.50	950.00	475.00
Bill						
10/22/2021	GVD	NL	Conference with J. Morris and J. Pomerantz re open issues in notes litigation	0.50	950.00	\$475.00
JAM	10/23/2021	NL	3.50	3.50	1,245.00	4,357.50
Bill						
10/23/2021	JAM	NL	E-mail to defense counsel re: discovery (0.4); e-mail to D. Deitz-Perez re: costs for cancelling Dondero deposition (0.1); e-mails w/ T. Surgent, P. Giep re: document production (0.2); prepare for depositions (2.7); tel c. w/ J. Seery re: facts, status, strategy of notes litigation (0.1).	3.50	1245.00	\$4,357.50
JAM	10/24/2021	NL	4.30	4.30	1,245.00	5,353.50
Bill						
10/24/2021	JAM	NL	Review documents and prepare for depositions (including sending documents to L. Canty, H. Winograd for production) (4.0); tel c. w/ J. Seery re: Notes Litigation facts and status (0.3).	4.30	1245.00	\$5,353.50

Pachulski Stang Ziehl & Jones LLP
 Highland Capital Management LP
 36027 -00003

Page: 110
 Prebill#287690
 November 05, 2021

					<u>Hours</u>	<u>Rate</u>	<u>Amount</u>
HRW Bill	10/24/2021	NL	3.00	3.00	695.00		2,085.00
10/24/2021	HRW	NL	Draft second HCMFA notes complaint (3.0).		3.00	695.00	\$2,085.00
HRW Bill	10/24/2021	NL	0.20	0.20	695.00		139.00
10/24/2021	HRW	NL	Review documents for notes production (0.2).		0.20	695.00	\$139.00
JNP Bill	10/25/2021	NL	1.00	1.00	1,295.00		1,295.00
10/25/2021	JNP	NL	Continue to prepare for oral argument on motion to dismiss.		1.00	1295.00	\$1,295.00
JNP Bill	10/25/2021	NL	0.10	0.10	1,295.00		129.50
10/25/2021	JNP	NL	Review emails regarding notes litigation discovery.		0.10	1295.00	\$129.50
JAM Bill	10/25/2021	NL	8.00	8.00	1,245.00		9,960.00
10/25/2021	JAM	NL	Work on Dondero deposition outline (5.3); tel c. w/ J. Seery re: notes litigation (0.1); communications w/ H. Winograd, P. Jeffries re: document production (0.3); prep session w/ D. Klos, K. Hendrix, H. Winograd (1.5); e-mail to defense counsel re: document production (0.3); e-mails w/ defense counsel re: deposition schedule (0.1); tel c. w/ H. Winograd re: notes litigation (0.2); review HCMFA document production (0.2).		8.00	1245.00	\$9,960.00
GVD Bill	10/25/2021	NL	0.40	0.40	950.00		380.00
10/25/2021	GVD	NL	Review limited partnership agreement re fiduciary duty issues and correspondence with J. Pomerantz re same		0.40	950.00	\$380.00
GVD Bill	10/25/2021	NL	0.30	0.30	950.00		285.00
10/25/2021	GVD	NL	Review and comment on new note adversary for HCMFA		0.30	950.00	\$285.00

Pachulski Stang Ziehl & Jones LLP
 Highland Capital Management LP
 36027 -00003

Page: 111
 Prebill#287690
 November 05, 2021

					<u>Hours</u>	<u>Rate</u>	<u>Amount</u>
HRW	10/25/2021	NL		2.50	2.50	695.00	1,737.50
Bill							
10/25/2021	HRW	NL	Review HCMFA supplemental documents (2.5).		2.50	695.00	\$1,737.50
HRW	10/25/2021	NL		1.50	1.50	695.00	1,042.50
Bill							
10/25/2021	HRW	NL	Review HCRE supplemental documents (1.5).		1.50	695.00	\$1,042.50
HRW	10/25/2021	NL		0.10	0.10	695.00	69.50
Bill							
10/25/2021	HRW	NL	Call with J. Morris re: Hendrix and Klos depo prep (0.1).		0.10	695.00	\$69.50
HRW	10/25/2021	NL		1.50	1.50	695.00	1,042.50
Bill							
10/25/2021	HRW	NL	Call with J. Morris, D. Klos, K. Hendrix re: depo prep (1.5).		1.50	695.00	\$1,042.50
HRW	10/25/2021	NL		0.30	0.30	695.00	208.50
Bill							
10/25/2021	HRW	NL	Review HCMFA supplemental production (0.3).		0.30	695.00	\$208.50
HRW	10/25/2021	NL		0.30	0.30	695.00	208.50
Bill							
10/25/2021	HRW	NL	Review notes litigation supplemental production (0.3).		0.30	695.00	\$208.50
HRW	10/25/2021	NL		0.50	0.50	695.00	347.50
Bill							
10/25/2021	HRW	NL	Edit and review HCMFA second notes complaint (0.5).		0.50	695.00	\$347.50
HRW	10/25/2021	NL		0.20	0.20	695.00	139.00
Bill							
10/25/2021	HRW	NL	Email J. Morris re: HCMFA notes discovery (0.2).		0.20	695.00	\$139.00
HRW	10/25/2021	NL		1.50	1.50	695.00	1,042.50
Bill							
10/25/2021	HRW	NL	Research issues for summary judgment in notes litigation (1.5).		1.50	695.00	\$1,042.50
JNP	10/26/2021	NL		0.40	0.40	1,295.00	518.00

Pachulski Stang Ziehl & Jones LLP
 Highland Capital Management LP
 36027 -00003

Page: 112
 Prebill#287690
 November 05, 2021

					<u>Hours</u>	<u>Rate</u>	<u>Amount</u>
Bill							
10/26/2021	JNP	NL	Conference with John A. Morris regarding depositions and strategy in notes litigation.		0.40	1295.00	\$518.00
JNP	10/26/2021	NL		1.10	1.10	1,295.00	1,424.50
Bill							
10/26/2021	JNP	NL	Continue to review cases regarding preparation for hearing on motion to dismiss.		1.10	1295.00	\$1,424.50
JAM	10/26/2021	NL		9.20	9.20	1,245.00	11,454.00
Bill							
10/26/2021	JAM	NL	Review of transcripts and begin outlining issues/facts (3.2); meet w/ D. Klos, K. Hendrix to prepare for depositions (2.7); tel c. w/ J. Pomerantz re: notes litigation (0.4); prepare for depositions, including review of expert report (1.8); e-mails w/ defense counsel re: discovery (0.4); meet w/ D. Klos re: Dondero compensation (0.4); tel c. w/ J. Pomerantz re: Dondero compensation and expert issues (0.3).		9.20	1245.00	\$11,454.00
GVD	10/26/2021	NL		0.40	0.40	950.00	380.00
Bill							
10/26/2021	GVD	NL	Conference with J. Morris and D. Klos re preparation for Klos deposition		0.40	950.00	\$380.00
HRW	10/26/2021	NL		2.00	2.00	695.00	1,390.00
Bill							
10/26/2021	HRW	NL	Research issues for consolidation of cases (2.0).		2.00	695.00	\$1,390.00
HRW	10/26/2021	NL		1.20	1.20	695.00	834.00
Bill							
10/26/2021	HRW	NL	Draft errata for opposition to MTD (1.2).		1.20	695.00	\$834.00
HRW	10/26/2021	NL		0.80	0.80	695.00	556.00
Bill							
10/26/2021	HRW	NL	Review notes litigation supplemental HCRE production (0.8).		0.80	695.00	\$556.00
HRW	10/26/2021	NL		0.10	0.10	695.00	69.50
Bill							
10/26/2021	HRW	NL	Review J. Morris email to counsel re: Dondero production in notes litigation (0.1).		0.10	695.00	\$69.50

Pachulski Stang Ziehl & Jones LLP
 Highland Capital Management LP
 36027 -00003

Page: 113
 Prebill#287690
 November 05, 2021

					<u>Hours</u>	<u>Rate</u>	<u>Amount</u>
HRW Bill	10/26/2021	NL	0.10	0.10	695.00		69.50
10/26/2021	HRW	NL	Review email from counsel re: Dondero notes production in notes litigation (0.1).		0.10	695.00	\$69.50
HRW Bill	10/26/2021	NL	0.20	0.20	695.00		139.00
10/26/2021	HRW	NL	Review Dondero responses to discovery requests in notes litigation (0.2).		0.20	695.00	\$139.00
HRW Bill	10/26/2021	NL	0.10	0.10	695.00		69.50
10/26/2021	HRW	NL	Email J. Morris re: HCRE supplemental production in notes litigation (0.1).		0.10	695.00	\$69.50
HRW Bill	10/26/2021	NL	0.10	0.10	695.00		69.50
10/26/2021	HRW	NL	Email J. Morris and J. Pomerantz re: errata for opposition to MTD in notes litigation (0.1).		0.10	695.00	\$69.50
HRW Bill	10/26/2021	NL	0.10	0.10	695.00		69.50
10/26/2021	HRW	NL	Email local counsel re: errata for opposition to MTD in notes litigation (0.1).		0.10	695.00	\$69.50
HRW Bill	10/26/2021	NL	0.10	0.10	695.00		69.50
10/26/2021	HRW	NL	Review email from local counsel re: errata for opposition to MTD in notes litigation (0.1).		0.10	695.00	\$69.50
JNP Bill	10/27/2021	NL	1.30	1.30	1,295.00		1,683.50
10/27/2021	JNP	NL	Continue to prepare for hearing on motion to dismiss.		1.30	1295.00	\$1,683.50
JNP Bill	10/27/2021	NL	0.30	0.30	1,295.00		388.50
10/27/2021	JNP	NL	Conference with Gregory V. Demo, John A. Morris and J. Seery regarding Klos and Hendrix depositions.		0.30	1295.00	\$388.50
JAM	10/27/2021	NL	9.00	9.00	1,245.00		11,205.00

Pachulski Stang Ziehl & Jones LLP
 Highland Capital Management LP
 36027 -00003

Page: 114
 Prebill#287690
 November 05, 2021

				<u>Hours</u>	<u>Rate</u>	<u>Amount</u>
Bill						
10/27/2021	JAM	NL	Prepare for depositions (0.6); e-mails w/ defense counsel re: document production (0.2); Hendrix and Klos depositions (7.7); tel c. w/ J. Seery, J. Pomerantz, G. Demo re: depositions (and certain unrelated matters) (0.5).	9.00	1245.00	\$11,205.00
GVD	10/27/2021	NL		0.50	0.50	950.00
Bill						475.00
10/27/2021	GVD	NL	Attend K. Hendrix deposition (partial)	0.50	950.00	\$475.00
HRW	10/27/2021	NL		0.50	0.50	695.00
Bill						347.50
10/27/2021	HRW	NL	Review HCMFA supplemental documents for notes litigations (0.5).	0.50	695.00	\$347.50
HRW	10/27/2021	NL		0.10	0.10	695.00
Bill						69.50
10/27/2021	HRW	NL	Email J. Morris re: HCMFA and HCRE supplemental documents for notes litigations (0.1).	0.10	695.00	\$69.50
HRW	10/27/2021	NL		2.00	2.00	695.00
Bill						1,390.00
10/27/2021	HRW	NL	Research re: summary judgment standard for notes litigations (2.0).	2.00	695.00	\$1,390.00
HRW	10/27/2021	NL		0.10	0.10	695.00
Bill						69.50
10/27/2021	HRW	NL	Email local counsel re: errata for opposition briefs to MTD (0.1).	0.10	695.00	\$69.50
HRW	10/27/2021	NL		1.00	1.00	695.00
Bill						695.00
10/27/2021	HRW	NL	Draft errata for opposition briefs to MTD (1.0).	1.00	695.00	\$695.00
HRW	10/27/2021	NL		3.00	3.00	695.00
Bill						2,085.00
10/27/2021	HRW	NL	Hendrix deposition for notes litigations (3.0).	3.00	695.00	\$2,085.00
HRW	10/27/2021	NL		2.50	2.50	695.00
Bill						1,737.50
10/27/2021	HRW	NL	Klos deposition for notes litigations (2.5).	2.50	695.00	\$1,737.50

Pachulski Stang Ziehl & Jones LLP
 Highland Capital Management LP
 36027 -00003

Page: 115
 Prebill#287690
 November 05, 2021

					<u>Hours</u>	<u>Rate</u>	<u>Amount</u>
JNP Bill	10/28/2021	NL	2.00	2.00	1,295.00		2,590.00
10/28/2021	JNP	NL	Continue to prepare for hearing on motion to dismiss.		2.00	1295.00	\$2,590.00
JAM Bill	10/28/2021	NL	6.70	6.70	1,245.00		8,341.50
10/28/2021	JAM	NL	Amend six deposition notices (0.3); e-mail to counsel re: Dondero deposition (0.1); tel c. w/ J. Seery re: notes litigation (0.5); communications w/ L. Canty, P. Jeffries re: Dondero deposition and exhibits (0.6); tel c. w/ H. Winograd re: notes litigation (0.8); prepare for Dondero deposition (4.1); tel c. w/ G. Demo re: notes litigation (0.2); tel c. w/ D. Rukavina, H. Winograd re: witnesses (0.1).		6.70	1245.00	\$8,341.50
GVD Bill	10/28/2021	NL	0.20	0.20	950.00		190.00
10/28/2021	GVD	NL	Conference with J. Morris re potential expert discovery issues		0.20	950.00	\$190.00
GVD Bill	10/28/2021	NL	0.20	0.20	950.00		190.00
10/28/2021	GVD	NL	Conference with J. Morris re deposition issues re notes litigation		0.20	950.00	\$190.00
HRW Bill	10/28/2021	NL	0.80	0.80	695.00		556.00
10/28/2021	HRW	NL	Call with J. Morris re: notes litigations (0.8).		0.80	695.00	\$556.00
HRW Bill	10/28/2021	NL	0.10	0.10	695.00		69.50
10/28/2021	HRW	NL	Review email from counsel re: extension for expert reports in notes litigation (0.1).		0.10	695.00	\$69.50
HRW Bill	10/28/2021	NL	0.20	0.20	695.00		139.00
10/28/2021	HRW	NL	Send counsel supplemental production for notes litigations and related tasks (0.2).		0.20	695.00	\$139.00

Pachulski Stang Ziehl & Jones LLP
 Highland Capital Management LP
 36027 -00003

Page: 116
 Prebill#287690
 November 05, 2021

					<u>Hours</u>	<u>Rate</u>	<u>Amount</u>
HRW Bill	10/28/2021	NL	7.00	7.00	695.00		4,865.00
10/28/2021	HRW	NL	Research re: summary judgment in notes litigation (7.0).		7.00	695.00	\$4,865.00
HRW Bill	10/28/2021	NL	0.20	0.20	695.00		139.00
10/28/2021	HRW	NL	Review and finalize errata for opposition briefs to MTD in notes litigation (0.2).		0.20	695.00	\$139.00
HRW Bill	10/28/2021	NL	0.20	0.20	695.00		139.00
10/28/2021	HRW	NL	Review and edit amended deposition notices in notes litigation (0.2).		0.20	695.00	\$139.00
HRW Bill	10/28/2021	NL	0.10	0.10	695.00		69.50
10/28/2021	HRW	NL	Email local counsel re: amended deposition notices in notes litigation (0.1).		0.10	695.00	\$69.50
JNP Bill	10/29/2021	NL	2.50	2.50	1,295.00		3,237.50
10/29/2021	JNP	NL	Continue preparing for hearing on motion to dismiss.		2.50	1295.00	\$3,237.50
JNP Bill	10/29/2021	NL	0.20	0.20	1,295.00		259.00
10/29/2021	JNP	NL	Conference with Jordan A. Kroop regarding overlap between motion to dismiss and motion to enforce in notes litigation.		0.20	1295.00	\$259.00
JNP Bill	10/29/2021	NL	0.10	0.10	1,295.00		129.50
10/29/2021	JNP	NL	Review of NexPoint motion to extend time to designate experts.		0.10	1295.00	\$129.50
JMF Bill	10/29/2021	NL	0.30	0.30	1,050.00		315.00
10/29/2021	JMF	NL	Review motions to extend expert discovery deadlines.		0.30	1050.00	\$315.00
JAM	10/29/2021	NL	11.90	11.90	1,245.00		14,815.50

Pachulski Stang Ziehl & Jones LLP
 Highland Capital Management LP
 36027 -00003

Page: 117
 Prebill#287690
 November 05, 2021

				<u>Hours</u>	<u>Rate</u>	<u>Amount</u>
Bill						
10/29/2021	JAM	NL	Prepare for Dondero deposition (4.2); Dondero deposition (including multiple calls with G. Demo, H. Winograd during breaks) (7.0); tel c. w/ G. Demo, H. Winograd re: post-deposition follow-up (0.5); tel c. w/ J. Seery re: Dondero deposition (0.2).	11.90	1245.00	\$14,815.50
GVD	10/29/2021	NL		2.80	2.80	950.00
Bill						
10/29/2021	GVD	NL	Attend deposition of J. Dondero (partial)	2.80	950.00	\$2,660.00
GVD	10/29/2021	NL		0.40	0.40	950.00
Bill						
10/29/2021	GVD	NL	Review emails re correspondence re prepayment allocation	0.40	950.00	\$380.00
GVD	10/29/2021	NL		1.00	1.00	950.00
Bill						
10/29/2021	GVD	NL	Multiple conferences with J. Morris and H. Winograd re status of Dondero deposition	1.00	950.00	\$950.00
HRW	10/29/2021	NL		5.00	5.00	695.00
Bill						
10/29/2021	HRW	NL	Dondero deposition for consolidated notes litigation (5.0).	5.00	695.00	\$3,475.00
HRW	10/29/2021	NL		1.00	1.00	695.00
Bill						
10/29/2021	HRW	NL	Research for summary judgment in consolidated notes litigation (1.0).	1.00	695.00	\$695.00
HRW	10/29/2021	NL		0.50	0.50	695.00
Bill						
10/29/2021	HRW	NL	Draft and review DC Sauter deposition subpoena and related documents (0.5).	0.50	695.00	\$347.50
HRW	10/29/2021	NL		0.20	0.20	695.00
Bill						
10/29/2021	HRW	NL	Email with local counsel re: DC Sauter deposition subpoena (0.2).	0.20	695.00	\$139.00

Pachulski Stang Ziehl & Jones LLP
 Highland Capital Management LP
 36027 -00003

Page: 118
 Prebill#287690
 November 05, 2021

					<u>Hours</u>	<u>Rate</u>	<u>Amount</u>
HRW Bill	10/29/2021	NL	0.60	0.60	695.00		417.00
10/29/2021	HRW	NL	Calls with J. Morris and G. Demo re: Dondero deposition (0.6).		0.60	695.00	\$417.00
HRW Bill	10/29/2021	NL	0.20	0.20	695.00		139.00
10/29/2021	HRW	NL	Review Waterhouse deposition transcript (0.2).		0.20	695.00	\$139.00
HRW Bill	10/29/2021	NL	0.30	0.30	695.00		208.50
10/29/2021	HRW	NL	Review NexPoint motion to extend discovery deadlines (0.3).		0.30	695.00	\$208.50
HRW Bill	10/29/2021	NL	0.10	0.10	695.00		69.50
10/29/2021	HRW	NL	Email HCMFA counsel re: deposition subpoena (0.1).		0.10	695.00	\$69.50
JAM Bill	10/30/2021	NL	4.30	4.30	1,245.00		5,353.50
10/30/2021	JAM	NL	Review documents and prepared for Alan Johnson (expert) deposition (4.3).		4.30	1245.00	\$5,353.50
JAM Bill	10/31/2021	NL	5.00	5.00	1,245.00		6,225.00
10/31/2021	JAM	NL	Prepare for Johnson deposition and for summary judgment (4.8); tel c. w/ J. Seery re: notes litigation (0.2).		5.00	1245.00	\$6,225.00
HRW Bill	10/31/2021	NL	2.20	2.20	695.00		1,529.00
10/31/2021	HRW	NL	Research and related tasks for response to NexPoint's motion to extend discovery deadlines (2.2).		2.20	695.00	\$1,529.00
HRW Bill	10/31/2021	NL	0.80	0.80	695.00		556.00
10/31/2021	HRW	NL	Review productions in notes litigations (0.8).		0.80	695.00	\$556.00

Pachulski Stang Ziehl & Jones LLP
 Highland Capital Management LP
 36027 -00003

Page: 119
 Prebill#287690
 November 05, 2021

					<u>Hours</u>	<u>Rate</u>	<u>Amount</u>
GVD Bill	11/01/2021	NL	0.10	0.10	950.00		95.00
11/01/2021	GVD	NL	Correspondence with J. Morris re filing of HCMFA adversary		0.10	950.00	\$95.00
GVD Bill	11/01/2021	NL	0.60	0.60	950.00		570.00
11/01/2021	GVD	NL	Conference with Quinn re status of notes litigation		0.60	950.00	\$570.00
JAK Bill	11/01/2021	NL	1.00	1.00	1,100.00		1,100.00
11/01/2021	JAK	NL	Strategy emails regarding reply to objection to motion to dismiss among Jeff Pomerantz, John Morris, and local co-counsel (0.5); review outline of argument for objection to motion to dismiss from Jeff Pomerantz (0.5);		1.00	1100.00	\$1,100.00
JAK Bill	11/01/2021	NL	0.90	0.90	1,100.00		990.00
11/01/2021	JAK	NL	Begin outlining argument for hearing on objection to motion for arbitration.		0.90	1100.00	\$990.00
GVD Bill	11/02/2021	NL	0.30	0.30	950.00		285.00
11/02/2021	GVD	NL	Conference with J. Morris re strategy for notes litigation		0.30	950.00	\$285.00
GVD Bill	11/03/2021	NL	1.20	1.20	950.00		1,140.00
11/03/2021	GVD	NL	Review draft arguments on motion to dismiss and motion to compel arbitration		1.20	950.00	\$1,140.00
GVD Bill	11/03/2021	NL	0.50	0.50	950.00		475.00
11/03/2021	GVD	NL	Initial conference with PSZJ team re preparation for oral argument (0.3); Attend follow up conference re preparation for oral argument (partial) (0.2)		0.50	950.00	\$475.00
GVD Bill	11/04/2021	NL	0.40	0.40	950.00		380.00
11/04/2021	GVD	NL	Conference with J. Morris re preparation for Dondero deposition		0.40	950.00	\$380.00

The image shows a vertical stack of numerous thin, dark rectangular objects, likely books or documents, arranged in a way that creates a series of horizontal bands across the frame. The objects are tightly packed, and their edges are visible, creating a textured, layered appearance. The lighting is even, highlighting the uniformity of the shapes while also showing slight variations in their thickness and alignment. The overall composition is minimalist and architectural, focusing on the repetition and arrangement of simple geometric forms.

EXHIBIT 181

IN THE UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS
DALLAS DIVISION

In re	§	
	§	
HIGHLAND CAPITAL MANAGEMENT,	§	Chapter 11
L.P.,	§	
	§	Case No. 19-34054-sgj11
Debtor.	§	
<hr style="border: 0.5px solid black;"/>		
HIGHLAND CAPITAL MANAGEMENT,	§	
L.P.,	§	
	§	
Plaintiff,	§	
	§	
v.	§	Adv. No. 21-03004
	§	
HIGHLAND CAPITAL MANAGEMENT	§	
FUND ADVISORS, L.P.	§	
	§	
Defendant.	§	

DECLARATION OF DENNIS C. SAUTER, JR.

I, Dennis C. Sauter, Jr., hereby swear under oath and penalty of perjury pursuant to the laws of the United States of America that the following is true and correct to the best of my knowledge and belief:

1. My name is Dennis C. Sauter, Jr. I am over the age of 21, have never been convicted of a felony or crime of moral turpitude, and am otherwise qualified to give this Declaration. I have personal knowledge of the facts stated in this Declaration, or such facts are known to me from my review of the books and records of Highland Capital Management Fund Advisors, L.P. ("HCMFA").

2. I am an attorney licensed to practice law in the State of Texas and have been such since 2001.

3. While I provided limited legal services to Highland Capital Management, L.P. (the “Debtor”) and its affiliated entities as outside counsel before I became in-house counsel, those services were limited to real estate transactions having nothing to do with the facts discussed in this Declaration.

4. HCMFA is a registered advisor under the Investment Advisors Act of 1940. CITE. As such, HCMFA advises various independent funds, which, in turn, are investment vehicles for a large number of investors.

5. HCMFA has always had very few employees. During 2019, for example, HCMFA had only 7 to 9 employees.

6. Instead, most of the services needed by HCMFA to transact its business were provided by the Debtor pursuant to that certain *Second Amended and Restated Shared Services Agreement* dated February 8, 2013 (the “Shared Services Agreement”), a true and correct copy of which is attached hereto as Exhibit 1.

7. This was standard business practices for the Debtor and various other affiliated companies, including other advisers within the Debtor’s and its affiliates “complex” of businesses: the Debtor would employ most of the employees and then share those employees with HCMFA and other “complex” entities in exchange for payments by HCMFA and such other entities.

8. Thus, under the Shared Services Agreement, employees of the Debtor (many of whom were highly trained and specialized) provided many of the key services to HCMFA on an as-needed basis. These services included legal, accounting, regulatory, compliance, IT, and tax services, among others. Additionally, under the Shared Services Agreement the Debtor provided critical electronic infrastructure to HCMFA and other “complex” entities, such that the books and records, and e-mail communications, of HCMFA were actually stored on the Debtor’s server.

9. These facts are very important to the issues I will discuss below.

10. On January 22, 2021, the Debtor filed its *Complaint for (i) Breach of Contract and (ii) Turnover of Property of the Debtor's Estate* (the "Complaint") against HCMFA, thereby initiating this Adversary Proceeding.

11. The Complaint concerns two promissory notes each dated May 2, 2019 (the "Notes") that the Debtor seeks a judgment against HCMFA for: (i) a note for \$5 million; and (ii) a note for \$2.4 million.

12. On March 1, 2021, HCMFA filed its *Defendant's Original Answer* (the "Answer").

13. At the time that the Debtor filed the Complaint, I promptly undertook an internal review of the background facts concerning the Notes. I had no knowledge of them since I had not been employed by HCMFA, and the few employees of HCMFA had no knowledge of the Notes. I also discussed the Notes with James Dondero, formerly the CEO of the Debtor, and Mr. Dondero could not recall the genesis of the Notes. My review of the limited books and records of HCMFA that were not in the possession of the Debtor did not reveal any background facts regarding the Notes or the existence of the Notes.

14. Normally, I would have discussed the Notes with employees of the Debtor who also provided services to HCMFA pursuant to the Shared Services Agreement in order to assess what defenses or affirmative defenses to the Complaint existed. However, in this instance I was precluded from doing so.

15. First, attached hereto as Exhibit 2 is a true and correct copy of an e-mail exchange between me and Mr. James Seery dated September 17, 2020. Mr. Seery was and remains the Chief Executive Officer of the Debtor. As stated in Exhibit 2, Mr. Seery was informing me that Debtor employees had been instructed not to discuss with me anything that is "inimical" to the interests of the Debtor, and that they would be terminated if they did so. This e-mail communication comports with other communications between myself and Mr. Seery and/or Debtor's counsel,

where I was cautioned not to discuss with Debtor employees matters that may be adverse to the Debtor.

16. Second, by the time of the filing of the Complaint, the Court had entered a preliminary injunction against Mr. Dondero, a true and correct copy of which is attached hereto as Exhibit 3. That injunction prohibited Mr. Dondero from “directly or indirectly . . . communicating with any of the Debtor’s employees, except as it specifically relates to shared services currently provided.” As the information concerning the Notes was background information and not related to “services currently provided,” I was concerned that, if I discussed the Notes with the Debtor’s employees, the Debtor would argue that either Mr. Dondero or I violated the Court’s injunction.

17. In sum, after the Complaint was filed, no one at HCMFA knew anything about the Notes, and I was precluded from contacting the people that would have known something about the notes, *i.e.* the Debtor’s employees, to discuss what they may have known. I also had very limited access to HCMFA books and records and, even if I had had full access, I would not have known what relevant books and records to search for in the many millions of files without first obtaining a generalized background of the facts regarding the Notes from Debtor employees.

18. I then worked with outside counsel at Munsch Hardt Kopf & Harr, P.C. to review the Complaint and prepare and file the Answer. That original Answer did not contain any affirmative defenses because, as explained above, no one at HCMFA knew of any facts that might give rise to an affirmative defense.

19. The situation changed by mid-April, 2021. As of late February, 2021, the Debtor terminated the Shared Services Agreement and terminated most of its former employees. Many of those employees then formed their own company, Skyview Group, which then contracted with HCMFA (and others) to continue providing essentially the same services that they had previously provided under the Shared Services Agreement. Additionally, the Debtor provided access to

HCMFA of much of its books and records (although not all). Thus, as of March, 2021, I was able to communicate with most former Debtor employees and to access the books and records of HCMFA without fear of violating any court order.

20. March, 2021, was exceedingly busy, to say the least. With the termination of the Shared Services Agreement, HCMFA, other entities that I am general counsel to, and I were preoccupied with transitioning the services that the Debtor had been providing for more than a decade to a new entity, using new infrastructure, new offices, new networks, etc., all for the primary goal of ensuring a smooth and uninterrupted continuity of business and services provided by HCMFA and others to third parties.

21. By mid-April, 2021, the situation had calmed down to the point that I was able to discuss the Notes with former employees, most importantly Frank Waterhouse ("Waterhouse") and Will Mabry ("Mabry"). Mabry in particular was able to provide me internal documents and memorandums that I had not previously known about or had access to that helped with the factual background of the Notes.

22. From these discussions and documents, I have been able to understand the factual background concerning the Notes, ultimately concluding that the Notes were signed by mistake by Waterhouse without authority from HCMFA and have no consideration and were never intended to be debt instruments of HCMFA.

23. My investigation has revealed the following.

24. One of the funds that HCMFA advises is Highland Global Allocation Fund ("GAF"). In March, 2018, GAF sold equity interests it held in TerreStar. As part of this, it was necessary to calculate the "net asset value" ("NAV") of these securities and of GAF assets. HCMFA was responsible for advising on the NAV. In turn, pursuant to the Shared Services Agreement and in accordance with applicable compliance and operating procedures, the Debtor

was responsible to HCMFA to calculate the NAV, and the Debtor had several employees charged with these and similar calculations as part of the Debtor's routine business services and as part of what the Debtor regularly provided to HCMFA and affiliated companies.

25. The Debtor made a mistake in calculating the NAV (the "NAV Error"). The NAV Error was discovered in early 2019 as GAF was being converted from an open-ended fund to a closed-ended fund. The Securities and Exchange Commission opened an investigation, and various employees and representatives of the Debtor, HCMFA, and GAF worked with the SEC to correct the error and to compensate GAF and the various investors in GAF harmed by the NAV Error.

26. Ultimately, and working with the SEC, the Debtor determined that the losses from the NAV Error to GAF and its shareholders amounted to \$7.5 million: (i) \$6.1 million for the NAV Error itself, as well as rebating related advisor fees and processing costs; and (ii) \$1.4 million of losses to the shareholders of GAF.

27. HCMFA accepted responsibility for the NAV Error and paid out \$5,186,496 on February 15, 2019 and \$2,398,842 on May 21, 2019. I am not sure of the flow of funds, whether the funds flowed through HCMFA or were paid by the Debtor on behalf of HCMFA, and discovery will likely clear that up. Either way, however, the payments were of HCMFA funds and on behalf of HCMFA.

28. In turn, the Debtor accepted responsibility to HCMFA for having caused the NAV Error, and the Debtor ultimately, whether through insurance or its own funds, compensated HCMFA for the above payments.

29. Returning to the Notes, Waterhouse was the Chief Financial Officer of both the Debtor and HCMFA during the above events and at the time he signed the Notes.

30. It appears clear that Waterhouse made a mistake in preparing and signing the Notes. First, , the Notes correspond very closely to the ultimate \$5,186,496 and \$2,398,842 payments. Second, it appears that Waterhouse assumed, incorrectly, that the funds being paid by the Debtor were a loan to HCMFA, instead of payments as compensation and restitution to HCMFA for the Debtor having caused the NAV Error. Third, it therefore appears that Waterhouse prepared the Notes for some internal accounting or other purpose, but without there being actual consideration for the Notes and without any intention on the part of the Debtor and HCMFA that there be Notes or that there be a loan transaction.


31. I also note that, as of May, 2019, HCMFA had executed other demand notes payable to the Debtor. On April 15, 2019, the Debtor executed that certain *Acknowledgement from HCMLP*, a true and correct copy of which is attached hereto as Exhibit 4. By the same, the Debtor agreed not to demand payment of these notes prior to May 31, 2021, because HCMFA believed that it would not be able to repay those notes prior to that time. It is illogical that, in light of the same, the Debtor would shortly thereafter lend an additional \$7.4 million to HCMFA. Rather, as my investigation has shown, the Debtor did not lend the funds to HCMFA but instead paid the funds, directly or indirectly, to compensate HCMFA for the NAV Error, which was the Debtor's error and therefore its obligation to correct and compensate for.

32. Therefore, in light of having learned of these facts in mid to late-April, 2019, HCMFA now believes that it has affirmative defenses to the Notes in the nature of mutual mistake, void for lack of consideration, and no proper authority of Waterhouse to sign the Notes.

33. Neither I, nor HCMFA, nor any of HCMFA's agents, have been less than diligent in investigating the Notes and the Complaint.

34. HCMFA respectfully requests that it be granted leave to assert these affirmative defenses in the Adversary Proceeding.

Signed: May 21, 2021


DENNIS C. SAUTER, JR.

**SECOND AMENDED AND RESTATED
SHARED SERVICES AGREEMENT**

THIS SECOND AMENDED AND RESTATED SHARED SERVICES AGREEMENT (this “**Agreement**”) is entered into to be effective as of 8th day of February, 2013 (the “**Effective Date**”) by and among Highland Capital Management, L.P., a Delaware limited partnership (“**HCMLP**”), and Highland Capital Management Fund Advisors, L.P., formerly known as Pyxis Capital, L.P., a Delaware limited partnership (“**HCMFA**”), and any affiliate of HCMFA that becomes a party hereto. Each of the signatories hereto is individually a “**Party**” and collectively the “**Parties**”.

RECITALS

A. During the Term, HCMLP will provide to HCMFA certain services as more fully described herein and the Parties desire to allocate the costs incurred for such services and assets among them in accordance with the terms and conditions in this Agreement.

AGREEMENT

In consideration of the foregoing recitals and the mutual covenants and conditions contained herein, the Parties agree, intending to be legally bound, as follows:

**ARTICLE I
DEFINITIONS**

“**Actual Cost**” means, with respect to any period hereunder, one hundred percent (100%) of the actual costs and expenses caused by, incurred or otherwise arising from or relating to (i) the Shared Services and (ii) the Shared Assets, in each case during such period.

“**Affiliate**” means a Person that directly, or indirectly through one or more intermediaries, controls, or is controlled by, or is under common control with, a specified Person. The term “**control**” (including, with correlative meanings, the terms “**controlled by**” and “**under common control with**”) means the possession of the power to direct the management and policies of the referenced Person, whether through ownership interests, by contract or otherwise.

“**Agreement**” has the meaning set forth in the preamble.

“**Allocation Percentage**” has the meaning set forth in Section 4.01.

“**Applicable Margin**” shall mean an additional amount equal to 5% of all costs allocated by Service Provider to the other parties hereto under Article IV; provided that the parties may agree on a different margin percentage as to any item or items to the extent the above margin percentage, together with the allocated cost of such item or service, would not reflect an arm’s length value of the particular service or item allocated.

“**Change**” has the meaning set forth in Section 2.02(a).

“**Change Request**” has the meaning set forth in Section 2.02(b).

“**Code**” means the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, as amended, and the related regulations and published interpretations.

“**Effective Date**” has the meaning set forth in the preamble.

“**Governmental Entity**” means any government or any regulatory agency, bureau, board, commission, court, department, official, political subdivision, tribunal or other instrumentality of any government, whether federal, state or local, domestic or foreign.

“**Liabilities**” means any cost, liability, indebtedness, obligation, co-obligation, commitment, expense, claim, deficiency, guaranty or endorsement of or by any Person of any nature (whether direct or indirect, known or unknown, absolute or contingent, liquidated or unliquidated, due or to become due, accrued or unaccrued, matured or unmatured).

“**Loss**” means any cost, damage, disbursement, expense, liability, loss, obligation, penalty or settlement, including interest or other carrying costs, legal, accounting and other professional fees and expenses incurred in the investigation, collection, prosecution and defense of claims and amounts paid in settlement, that may be imposed on or otherwise incurred or suffered by the referenced Person; provided, however, that the term “**Loss**” will not be deemed to include any special, exemplary or punitive damages, except to the extent such damages are incurred as a result of third party claims.

“**New Shared Service**” has the meaning set forth in Section 2.03.

“**Party**” or “**Parties**” has the meaning set forth in the preamble.

“**Person**” means an association, a corporation, an individual, a partnership, a limited liability company, a trust or any other entity or organization, including a Governmental Entity.

“**Quarterly Report**” has the meaning set forth in Section 5.01.

“**Recipient**” means HCMFA and any of HCMFA’s direct or indirect Subsidiaries or managed funds or accounts in their capacity as a recipient of the Shared Services and/or Shared Assets.

“**Service Provider**” means any of HCMLP and its direct or indirect Subsidiaries in its capacity as a provider of Shared Services or Shared Assets.

“**Service Standards**” has the meaning set forth in Section 6.01.

“**Shared Assets**” shall have the meaning set forth in Section 3.02.

“**Shared Services**” shall have the meaning set forth in Section 2.01.

“**Subsidiary**” means, with respect to any Person, any Person in which such Person has a direct or indirect equity ownership interest in excess of 50%.

“**Tax**” or “**Taxes**” means: (i) all state and local sales, use, value-added, gross receipts, foreign, privilege, utility, infrastructure maintenance, property, federal excise and similar levies, duties and other similar tax-like charges lawfully levied by a duly constituted taxing authority against or upon the Shared Services and the Shared Assets; and (ii) tax-related surcharges or fees that are related to the Shared Services and the Shared Assets identified and authorized by applicable tariffs.

“**Term**” has the meaning set forth in Section 7.01.

ARTICLE II SHARED SERVICES

Section 2.01 Services. During the Term, Service Provider will provide Recipient with Shared Services, including without limitation, all of the (i) finance and accounting services, (ii) human resources services, (iii) marketing services, (iv) legal services, (v) corporate services, (vi) information technology services, and (vii) operations services; each as requested by HCMFA and as described more fully on Annex A attached hereto, the “*Shared Services*”), it being understood that personnel providing Shared Services may be deemed to be employees of HCMFA to the extent necessary for purposes of the Investment Advisers Act of 1940, as amended.

Section 2.02 Changes to the Shared Services.

(a) During the Term, the Parties may agree to modify the terms and conditions of a Service Provider’s performance of any Shared Service in order to reflect new procedures, processes or other methods of providing such Shared Service, including modifying the applicable fees for such Shared Service to reflect the then current fair market value of such service (a “*Change*”). The Parties will negotiate in good faith the terms upon which a Service Provider would be willing to provide such New Shared Service to Recipient.

(b) The Party requesting a Change will deliver a description of the Change requested (a “*Change Request*”) and no Party receiving a Change Request may unreasonably withhold, condition or delay its consent to the proposed Change.

(c) Notwithstanding any provision of this Agreement to the contrary, a Service Provider may make: (i) Changes to the process of performing a particular Shared Service that do not adversely affect the benefits to Recipient of Service Provider’s provision or quality of such Shared Service in any material respect or increase Recipient’s cost for such Shared Service; (ii) emergency Changes on a temporary and short-term basis; and/or (iii) Changes to a particular Shared Service in order to comply with applicable law or regulatory requirements, in each case without obtaining the prior consent of Recipient. A Service Provider will notify Recipient in writing of any such Change as follows: in the case of clauses (i) and (iii) above, prior to the implementation of such Change, and, in the case of clause (ii) above, as soon as reasonably practicable thereafter.

Section 2.03 New Shared Services. The Parties may, from time to time during the Term of this Agreement, negotiate in good faith for Shared Services not otherwise specifically listed in Section 2.01 (a “*New Shared Service*”). Any agreement between the Parties on the terms for a New Shared Service must be in accordance with the provisions of Article IV and Article V hereof, will be deemed to be an amendment to this Agreement and such New Shared Service will then be a “*Shared Service*” for all purposes of this Agreement.

Section 2.04 Subcontractors. Nothing in this Agreement will prevent Service Provider from, with the consent of Recipient, using subcontractors, hired with due care, to perform all or any part of a Shared Service hereunder. A Service Provider will remain fully responsible for the performance of its obligations under this Agreement in accordance with its terms, including any obligations it performs through subcontractors, and a Service Provider will be solely responsible for payments due to its subcontractors.

ARTICLE III SHARED ASSETS

Section 3.01 Shared IP Rights. Each Service Provider hereby grants to Recipient a non-exclusive right and license to use the intellectual property and other rights granted or licensed, directly or indirectly, to such Service Provider (the “**Shared IP Rights**”) pursuant to third party intellectual property Agreements (“**Third Party IP Agreements**”), provided that the rights granted to Recipient hereunder are subject to the terms and conditions of the applicable Third Party IP Agreement, and that such rights shall terminate, as applicable, upon the expiration or termination of the applicable Third Party IP Agreement. Recipient shall be licensed to use the Shared IP Rights only for so long as it remains an Affiliate of HCMLP. In consideration of the foregoing licenses, Recipient agrees to take such further reasonable actions as a Service Provider deems to be necessary or desirable to comply with its obligations under the Third Party IP Agreements.

Section 3.02 Other Shared Assets. Subject to Section 3.01, each Service Provider hereby grants Recipient the right, license or permission, as applicable, to use and access the benefits under the agreements, contracts and licenses that such Service Provider will purchase, acquire, become a party or beneficiary to or license on behalf of Recipient (the “**Future Shared Assets**” and collectively with the Shared IP Rights, the “**Shared Assets**”).

ARTICLE IV COST ALLOCATION

Section 4.01 Actual Cost Allocation Formula. The Actual Cost of any item relating to any Shared Services or Shared Assets shall be allocated based on the Allocation Percentage. For purposes of this Agreement, “**Allocation Percentage**” means:

- (a) To the extent 100% of such item is demonstrably attributable to HCMFA, 100% of the Actual Cost of such item shall be allocated to HCMFA as agreed by HCMFA;
- (b) To the extent a specific percentage of use of such item can be determined (e.g., 70% for HCMLP and 30% for HCMFA), that specific percentage of the Actual Cost of such item will be allocated to HCMLP or HCMFA, as applicable and as agreed by HCMFA; and
- (c) All other portions of the Actual Cost of any item that cannot be allocated pursuant to clause (a) or (b) above shall be allocated between HCMLP and HCMFA in such proportion as is agreed in good faith between the parties.

Section 4.02 Non-Cash Cost Allocation. The actual, fully burdened cost of any item relating to any Shared Services or Shared Assets that does not result in a direct, out of pocket cash expense may be allocated to HCMLP and HCMFA for financial statement purposes only, as agreed by HCMFA, without any corresponding cash reimbursement required, in accordance with generally accepted accounting principles, based on the Allocation Percentage principles described in Section 4.01 hereof.

ARTICLE V PAYMENT OF COST AND REVENUE SHARE; TAXES

Section 5.01 Quarterly Statements. Within thirty (30) days following the end of each calendar quarter during the Term (or at such time as may be otherwise agreed by the parties), each Service Provider shall furnish the other Parties hereto with a written statement with respect to the Actual Cost paid by it in respect of Shared Services and Shared Assets provided by it, in each case, during such

period, setting forth (i) the cost allocation in accordance with Article IV hereof together with the Applicable Margin on such allocated amounts, and (ii) any amounts paid pursuant to Section 5.02 hereof, together with such other data and information necessary to complete the items described in Section 5.03 hereof (hereinafter referred to as the “**Quarterly Report**”).

Section 5.02 Settlement Payments. At any time during the Term, any Party may make payment of the amounts that are allocable to such Party together with the Applicable Margin related thereto, regardless of whether an invoice pursuant to Section 5.03 hereof has been issued with respect to such amounts.

Section 5.03 Determination and Payment of Cost and Revenue Share.

(a) Within ten (10) days of the submission of the Quarterly Report described in Section 5.02 hereof (or at such other time as may be agreed by the parties), the Parties shall (i) agree on the cost share of each of the Parties and Applicable Margin as calculated pursuant to the provisions of this Agreement; and (ii) prepare and issue invoices for the cost share and Applicable Margin payments that are payable by any of the Parties.

(b) Within ten (10) days of preparation of the agreement and the issuance of the invoice described in Section 5.03(a) (or at such other time as may be agreed by the parties), the Parties shall promptly make payment of the amounts that are set forth on such cost allocation invoice. Notwithstanding anything in this Agreement to the contrary, provision of the Shared Services shall commence from the Effective Date, but no fees shall be payable from Recipient or otherwise accrue with respect to such services provided during the month of December 2011.

Section 5.04 Taxes.

(a) Recipient is responsible for and will pay all Taxes applicable to the Shared Services and the Shared Assets provided to Recipient, provided, that such payments by Recipient to Service Provider will be made in the most tax-efficient manner and provided further, that Service Provider will not be subject to any liability for Taxes applicable to the Shared Services and the Shared Assets as a result of such payment by Recipient. Service Provider will collect such Tax from Recipient in the same manner it collects such Taxes from other customers in the ordinary course of Service Provider’s business, but in no event prior to the time it invoices Recipient for the Shared Services and Shared Assets, costs for which such Taxes are levied. Recipient may provide Service Provider with a certificate evidencing its exemption from payment of or liability for such Taxes.

(b) Service Provider will reimburse Recipient for any Taxes collected from Recipient and refunded to Service Provider. In the event a Tax is assessed against Service Provider that is solely the responsibility of Recipient and Recipient desires to protest such assessment, Recipient will submit to Service Provider a statement of the issues and arguments requesting that Service Provider grant Recipient the authority to prosecute the protest in Service Provider’s name. Service Provider’s authorization will not be unreasonably withheld. Recipient will finance, manage, control and determine the strategy for such protest while keeping Service Provider reasonably informed of the proceedings. However, the authorization will be periodically reviewed by Service Provider to determine any adverse impact on Service Provider, and Service Provider will have the right to reasonably withdraw such authority at any time. Upon notice by Service Provider that it is so withdrawing such authority, Recipient will expeditiously terminate all proceedings. Any adverse consequences suffered by Recipient as a result of the withdrawal will be submitted to arbitration pursuant to Section 9.14. Any contest for Taxes brought by Recipient may not result in any lien attaching to any property or rights of Service Provider or otherwise jeopardize Service Provider’s interests or rights in any of its property. Recipient agrees to

indemnify Service Provider for all Losses that Service Provider incurs as a result of any such contest by Recipient.

(c) The provisions of this Section 5.04 will govern the treatment of all Taxes arising as a result of or in connection with this Agreement notwithstanding any other Article of this Agreement to the contrary.

ARTICLE VI SERVICE PROVIDER RESPONSIBILITIES

Section 6.01 Service Provider General Obligations. Service Provider will provide the Shared Services and the Shared Assets to Recipient on a non-discriminatory basis and will provide the Shared Services and the Shared Assets in the same manner as if it were providing such services and assets on its own account (the “*Service Standards*”). Service Provider will conduct its duties hereunder in a lawful manner in compliance with applicable laws, statutes, rules and regulations and in accordance with the Service Standards, including, for avoidance of doubt, laws and regulations relating to privacy of customer information.

Section 6.02 Books and Records; Access to Information. Service Provider will keep and maintain books and records on behalf of Recipient in accordance with past practices and internal control procedures. Recipient will have the right, at any time and from time to time upon reasonable prior notice to Service Provider, to inspect and copy (at its expense) during normal business hours at the offices of Service Provider the books and records relating to the Shared Services and Shared Assets, with respect to Service Provider’s performance of its obligations hereunder. This inspection right will include the ability of Recipient’s financial auditors to review such books and records in the ordinary course of performing standard financial auditing services for Recipient (but subject to Service Provider imposing reasonable access restrictions to Service Provider’s and its Affiliates’ proprietary information and such financial auditors executing appropriate confidentiality agreements reasonably acceptable to Service Provider). Service Provider will promptly respond to any reasonable requests for information or access. For the avoidance of doubt, all books and records kept and maintained by Service Provider on behalf of Recipient shall be the property of Recipient, and Service Provider will surrender promptly to Recipient any of such books or records upon Recipient’s request (provided that Service Provider may retain a copy of such books or records) and shall make all such books and records available for inspection and use by the Securities and Exchange Commission or any person retained by Recipient at all reasonable times. Such records shall be maintained by Service Provider for the periods and in the places required by laws and regulations applicable to Recipient.

Section 6.03 Return of Property and Equipment. Upon expiration or termination of this Agreement, Service Provider will be obligated to return to Recipient, as soon as is reasonably practicable, any equipment or other property or materials of Recipient that is in Service Provider’s control or possession.

ARTICLE VII TERM AND TERMINATION

Section 7.01 Term. The term of this Agreement will commence as of the Effective Date and will continue in full force and effect until the first anniversary of the Effective Date (the “*Term*”), unless terminated earlier in accordance with Section 9.02. The Term shall automatically renew for successive one year periods unless sooner terminated under Section 7.02.

Section 7.02 Termination. Either Party may terminate this Agreement, with or without cause, upon at least 60 days advance written notice at any time prior to the expiration of the Term.

ARTICLE VIII LIMITED WARRANTY

Section 8.01 Limited Warranty. Service Provider will perform the Shared Services hereunder in accordance with the Service Standards. Except as specifically provided in this Agreement, Service Provider makes no express or implied representations, warranties or guarantees relating to its performance of the Shared Services and the granting of the Shared Assets under this Agreement, including any warranty of merchantability, fitness, quality, non-infringement of third party rights, suitability or adequacy of the Shared Services and the Shared Assets for any purpose or use or purpose. Service Provider will (to the extent possible and subject to Service Provider's contractual obligations) pass through the benefits of any express warranties received from third parties relating to any Shared Service and Shared Asset, and will (at Recipient's expense) assist Recipient with any warranty claims related thereto.

ARTICLE IX MISCELLANEOUS

Section 9.01 No Partnership or Joint Venture; Independent Contractor. Nothing contained in this Agreement will constitute or be construed to be or create a partnership or joint venture between or among HCMLP or HCMFA or their respective successors or assigns. The Parties understand and agree that, with the exception of the procurement by Service Provider of licenses or other rights on behalf of Recipient pursuant to Section 3.01, this Agreement does not make any of them an agent or legal representative of the other for any purpose whatsoever. With the exception of the procurement by Service Provider of licenses or other rights on behalf of Recipient pursuant to Section 3.01, no Party is granted, by this Agreement or otherwise, any right or authority to assume or create any obligation or responsibilities, express or implied, on behalf of or in the name of any other Party, or to bind any other Party in any manner whatsoever. The Parties expressly acknowledge that Service Provider is an independent contractor with respect to Recipient in all respects, including with respect to the provision of the Shared Services.

Section 9.02 Amendments; Waivers. Except as expressly provided herein, this Agreement may be amended only by agreement in writing of all Parties. No waiver of any provision nor consent to any exception to the terms of this Agreement or any agreement contemplated hereby will be effective unless in writing and signed by all of the Parties affected and then only to the specific purpose, extent and instance so provided. No failure on the part of any Party to exercise or delay in exercising any right hereunder will be deemed a waiver thereof, nor will any single or partial exercise preclude any further or other exercise of such or any other right.

Section 9.03 Schedules and Exhibits; Integration. Each Schedule and Exhibit delivered pursuant to the terms of this Agreement must be in writing and will constitute a part of this Agreement, although schedules need not be attached to each copy of this Agreement. This Agreement, together with such Schedules and Exhibits constitutes the entire agreement among the Parties pertaining to the subject matter hereof and supersedes all prior agreements and understandings of the Parties in connection therewith.

Section 9.04 Further Assurances. Each Party will take such actions as any other Party may reasonably request or as may be necessary or appropriate to consummate or implement the transactions contemplated by this Agreement or to evidence such events or matters.

Section 9.05 Governing Law. This Agreement and the legal relations between the Parties will be governed by and construed in accordance with the laws of the State of Texas applicable to contracts made and performed in such State and without regard to conflicts of law doctrines unless certain matters are preempted by federal law.

Section 9.06 Assignment. Except as otherwise provided hereunder, neither this Agreement nor any rights or obligations hereunder are assignable by one Party without the express prior written consent of the other Parties.

Section 9.07 Headings. The descriptive headings of the Articles, Sections and subsections of this Agreement are for convenience only and do not constitute a part of this Agreement.

Section 9.08 Counterparts. This Agreement and any amendment hereto or any other agreement delivered pursuant hereto may be executed in one or more counterparts and by different Parties in separate counterparts. All counterparts will constitute one and the same agreement and will become effective when one or more counterparts have been signed by each Party and delivered to the other Parties.

Section 9.09 Successors and Assigns; No Third Party Beneficiaries. This Agreement is binding upon and will inure to the benefit of each Party and its successors or assigns, and nothing in this Agreement, express or implied, is intended to confer upon any other Person or Governmental Entity any rights or remedies of any nature whatsoever under or by reason of this Agreement.

Section 9.10 Notices. All notices, demands and other communications to be given or delivered under or by reason of the provisions of this Agreement will be in writing and will be deemed to have been given: (i) immediately when personally delivered; (ii) when received by first class mail, return receipt requested; (iii) one day after being sent for overnight delivery by Federal Express or other overnight delivery service; or (iv) when receipt is acknowledged, either electronically or otherwise, if sent by facsimile, telecopy or other electronic transmission device. Notices, demands and communications to the other Parties will, unless another address is specified by such Parties in writing, be sent to the addresses indicated below:

If to HCMLP, addressed to:

Highland Capital Management, L.P.
300 Crescent Court, Suite 700
Dallas, Texas 75201
Attention: General Counsel
Fax: (972) 628-4147

If to HCMFA, addressed to:

Highland Capital Management Fund Advisors, L.P.
300 Crescent Court, Suite 700
Dallas, Texas 75201
Attention: General Counsel
Fax: (972) 628-4147

Section 9.11 Expenses. Except as otherwise provided herein, the Parties will each pay their own expenses incident to the negotiation, preparation and performance of this Agreement, including the fees, expenses and disbursements of their respective investment bankers, accountants and counsel.

Section 9.12 Waiver. No failure on the part of any Party to exercise or delay in exercising any right hereunder will be deemed a waiver thereof, nor will any single or partial exercise preclude any further or other exercise of such or any other right.

Section 9.13 Severability. If any provision of this Agreement is held to be unenforceable for any reason, it will be adjusted rather than voided, if possible, to achieve the intent of the Parties. All other provisions of this Agreement will be deemed valid and enforceable to the extent possible.

Section 9.14 Arbitration; Jurisdiction. Notwithstanding anything contained in this Agreement or the Annexes hereto to the contrary, in the event there is an unresolved legal dispute between the parties and/or any of their respective officers, directors, partners, employees, agents, affiliates or other representatives that involves legal rights or remedies arising from this Agreement, the parties agree to submit their dispute to binding arbitration under the authority of the Federal Arbitration Act; provided, however, that either party or such applicable affiliate thereof may pursue a temporary restraining order and/or preliminary injunctive relief in connection with confidentiality covenants or agreements binding on the other party, with related expedited discovery for the parties, in a court of law, and, thereafter, require arbitration of all issues of final relief. The Arbitration will be conducted by the American Arbitration Association, or another, mutually agreeable arbitration service. The arbitrator(s) shall be duly licensed to practice law in the State of Texas. The discovery process shall be limited to the following: Each side shall be permitted no more than (i) two party depositions of six hours each. Each deposition is to be taken pursuant to the Texas Rules of Civil Procedure; (ii) one non-party deposition of six hours; (iii) twenty-five interrogatories; (iv) twenty-five requests for admission; (v) ten requests for production. In response, the producing party shall not be obligated to produce in excess of 5,000 total pages of documents. The total pages of documents shall include electronic documents; (vi) one request for disclosure pursuant to the Texas Rules of Civil Procedure. Any discovery not specifically provided for in this paragraph, whether to parties or non-parties, shall not be permitted. The arbitrator(s) shall be required to state in a written opinion all facts and conclusions of law relied upon to support any decision rendered. No arbitrator will have authority to render a decision that contains an outcome determinative error of state or federal law, or to fashion a cause of action or remedy not otherwise provided for under applicable state or federal law. Any dispute over whether the arbitrator(s) has failed to comply with the foregoing will be resolved by summary judgment in a court of law. In all other respects, the arbitration process will be conducted in accordance with the American Arbitration Association's dispute resolution rules or other mutually agreeable, arbitration service rules. The party initiating arbitration shall pay all arbitration costs and arbitrator's fees, subject to a final arbitration award on who should bear costs and fees. All proceedings shall be conducted in Dallas, Texas, or another mutually agreeable site. Each party shall bear its own attorneys fees, costs and expenses, including any costs of experts, witnesses and/or travel, subject to a final arbitration award on who should bear costs and fees. The duty to arbitrate described above shall survive the termination of this Agreement. Except as otherwise provided above, the parties hereby waive trial in a court of law or by jury. All other rights, remedies, statutes of limitation and defenses applicable to claims asserted in a court of law will apply in the arbitration.


Section 9.15 General Rules of Construction. For all purposes of this Agreement and the Exhibits and Schedules delivered pursuant to this Agreement: (i) the terms defined in Article I have the meanings assigned to them in Article I and include the plural as well as the singular; (ii) all accounting terms not otherwise defined herein have the meanings assigned under GAAP; (iii) all references in this Agreement to designated "Articles," "Sections" and other subdivisions are to the designated Articles, Sections and other subdivisions of the body of this Agreement; (iv) pronouns of either gender or neuter will include, as appropriate, the other pronoun forms; (v) the words "herein," "hereof" and "hereunder" and other words of similar import refer to this Agreement as a whole and not to any particular Article, Section or other subdivision; (vi) "or" is not exclusive; (vii) "including" and "includes" will be deemed to be followed by "but not limited to" and "but is not limited to, "respectively; (viii) any definition of or

reference to any law, agreement, instrument or other document herein will be construed as referring to such law, agreement, instrument or other document as from time to time amended, supplemented or otherwise modified; and (ix) any definition of or reference to any statute will be construed as referring also to any rules and regulations promulgated thereunder.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, each of the Parties has caused this Agreement to be executed by its duly authorized officers as of the day and year first above written.


HIGHLAND CAPITAL MANAGEMENT, L.P.

By: Strand Advisors, Inc., its general partner

By: 
Name: James Dondero
Title: President

**HIGHLAND CAPITAL MANAGEMENT FUND
ADVISORS, L.P.**

By: Strand Advisors XVI, Inc., its general partner

By: 
Name: Brian Mitts
Title: Assistant Secretary

Annex A

Shared Services

Compliance

General compliance
Compliance systems

Facilities

Equipment
General Overhead
Office Supplies
Rent & Parking

Finance & Accounting

Book keeping
Cash management
Cash forecasting
Credit facility reporting
Financial reporting
Accounts payable
Accounts receivable
Expense reimbursement
Vendor management

HR

Drinks/snacks
Lunches
Recruiting

IT

General support & maintenance (OMS, development, support)
Telecom (cell, phones, broadband)
WSO

Legal

Corporate secretarial services
Document review and preparation
Litigation support
Management of outside counsel

Marketing and PR

Public relations

Tax

Tax audit support
Tax planning
Tax prep and filing

Investments

Investment research on an ad hoc basis as requested by HCMFA

Trading Valuation Committee
Trading desk services
Operations Trade settlement

Rukavina, Davor

From: James Seery <jpseeryjr@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, September 17, 2020 4:17 PM
To: DC Sauter
Cc: Gregory V. Demo
Subject: Re: Acis Settlement

DC

I believe your concerns regarding the release are misplaced as it does not bind entities that HCMLP does not control. Greg can walk you through the language, but I do not believe it requires adjustment nor does it create any liability. To the contrary, it reduces liability.

With regard to the HCMLP employee prohibitions, no employee whether legal or non-legal can work on any matter that is inimical to the interests of HCMLP. I, as CEO, and the Independent Board will make the determination as to whether an action violates the prohibition, and a breach of the prohibition will lead to termination for cause. I believe that most of the employees have been informed of this requirement and are following the directive.

With regard to transactional matters, HCMLP employees will continue to work with you on those issues that do not run afoul of the prohibition above. If there is a particular matter where you are taking a potentially adversarial action vis a vis HCMLP, please let me know what it is. We can then consider whether a customized operating protocol for that issue is needed or whether you will simply be on your own. I will make the determination with the advice of counsel. We do not believe the Texas rules of professional responsibility apply in this situation.

Please let me know what matter you are considering with respect to the immediately preceding paragraph, and we will consider how to best address your concerns.

Best. Jim

Jim Seery
631-804-2049
jpseeryjr@gmail.com

From: DC Sauter <DSauter@NexPointadvisors.com>
Date: Thursday, September 17, 2020 at 4:56 PM
To: Jim Seery <jpseeryjr@gmail.com>
Cc: Greg Demo <GDemo@pszjlaw.com>
Subject: RE: Acis Settlement

Jim/Greg, follow up on my email below. I have a few items that have been placed on my plate, and I really need to understand who I can speak with and the extent to which they are permitted to share information with me.

D.C. SAUTER

NEXPOINT

O: 972.628.4117 | C: 469.877.6440

From: DC Sauter
Sent: Tuesday, September 15, 2020 8:55 AM
To: 'James Seery' <jpseeryjr@gmail.com>
Cc: Gregory V. Demo <GDemo@pszjlaw.com>
Subject: RE: Acis Settlement

My apologies for copying Isaac. I was under the mistaken impression that he would have assisted in the settlement.

In my view, the requested clarification is beneficial to Strand, HCMLP, and the other "HCMLP Entities." The documents purport to release ACIS from claims on behalf of, among others, any entity that is "managed" by HCMLP and "respective current advisors, trustees, directors, officers, managers, members, partners, current or former employees, beneficiaries, shareholders, agents, participants, subsidiaries, parents, affiliates, successors, designees, and assigns" of any "HCMLP Entity." Those "HCMLP Entities" lack the authority to bind a whole host of parties in that laundry list, which could result in claims against HCMLP, Strand, and the other "HCMLP Entities" by both the "ACIS Released Parties," who will claim they didn't receive the benefit of the bargain, and the parties on whose behalf the "HCMLP Parties" purported to release claims who didn't consent to the release.

Additionally, I'd like to visit with you all regarding the board's position that prohibits certain HCMLP personnel from working on certain matters.

First, I am unclear whether the prohibition applies to only HCMLP legal personnel or whether it applies to all HCMLP employees. Please clarify.

Second, as you may know, virtually all of these matters are falling into my lap, and in most cases I lack any knowledge about them. It would help me tremendously if current HCMLP employees, and particularly the legal personnel, could provide me with transactional background to assist in the transition of the matter. While I understand the board's concern with Judge Jernigan's order, I don't believe that the Texas Disciplinary Rules of Professional Conduct mandate or even permit an attorney licensed in the State of Texas to refuse to cooperate with a former client in the transfer of a matter to a new attorney. Rule 1.15(d) states that "[u]pon termination of representation, a lawyer shall take steps to the extent reasonably practicable to protect a client's interests, such as giving reasonable notice to the client, allowing time for employment of other counsel, surrendering papers and property to which the client is entitled and refunding any advance payments of fee that has not been earned." The comments to that rule provide additional clarity: "In every instance of withdrawal and even if the lawyer has been unfairly discharged by the client, a lawyer must take all reasonable steps to mitigate the consequences to the client." T.D.R.P.C. Rule 1.15, comment 9. Proper steps may include providing information to new counsel or even continuing to represent the client for a limited time to meet impending deadlines. *Microsoft Corp. v. Commonwealth Sci. & Indus. Research Org.*, 2007 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 91550 *23-24 fn. 11 (E.D. Tex. Dec. 13, 2007). Even if the board insists that the HCMLP legal personnel cannot continue to represent others in non-HCMLP matters or matters adverse to HCMLP (irrespective of any conflict of interest analysis of whether those attorneys may continue to represent HCMLP in those matters), the ethical rules require that the attorneys provide assistance in transferring those matters to me or others.

Finally, I routinely handle, and am routinely asked to handle, legal matters that relate to real estate for entities owned or controlled by HCMLP (Park West, the Arizona assets, the Maple Ave. property, to name a few). I am not an HCMLP employee, and it's my understanding that NexPoint Advisors, L.P. is not compensated for the time I spend on HCMLP matters. I'm not suggesting that this arrangement should change, but it feels from my perspective that the board's position is only working in one direction. In other words, if I understand the board's position correctly, I can work on both NexPoint and HCMLP matters, but the HCMLP legal employees may only work on HCMLP-related matters. It has also put a significant amount of additional work on my plate. I would like to understand two things. First, what is the scope of my authority in these matters, and what is the proper protocol vis-à-vis you, DSI, and the board? I have tried to take the conservative approach in keeping you all informed and asking for consent or approval where I thought it

appropriate. I assume this is how you'd like to continue to handle things, but I would like confirmation of that. Second, I have heard that you all were working to transfer a couple of the legal personnel (perhaps Thedford and Post) to HCMFA so they could assist with the work load (particularly in the areas where I don't have a significant amount of experience). I'd like to know where that stands and when relief can be expected.

I'm available most of today and tomorrow to discuss.

D.C. SAUTER

NEXPOINT

O: 972.628.4117 | C: 469.877.6440

From: James Seery <jseeryjr@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, September 15, 2020 7:01 AM
To: DC Sauter <DSauter@NexPointadvisors.com>
Cc: Gregory V. Demo <GDemo@pszjlaw.com>; Isaac Leventon <ILeventon@HighlandCapital.com>
Subject: Re: Acis Settlement

DC. We will discuss and revert to you. Neither Isaac nor anyone else at HCMLP is permitted to work on any issues related to the settlement and release other than as directed by me.

Thanks

Sent from my iPad

On Sep 14, 2020, at 7:08 PM, DC Sauter <DSauter@nexpointadvisors.com> wrote:

Greg,

I've been asked to review the attached release on behalf of HCMFA and the closed-end funds. I'm concerned that the language below creates an ambiguity as to whether the closed-end funds and HCMFA have released claims against the ACIS parties:

1. The release by Strand, which also serves as the general partner of HCMFA; and
2. The release by each "HCMLP Entity" of its "respective current advisors, trustees, directors, officers, managers, members, partners, current or former employees, beneficiaries, shareholders, agents, participants, subsidiaries, parents, affiliates, successors, designees, and assigns."

We would like the final sentence in paragraph 1.a. of the Release to be revised to specifically identify HCMFA and the closed-end funds as parties not covered by the release. Please let me know if you'd like to discuss in more detail.

D.C. SAUTER | GENERAL COUNSEL, REAL ESTATE

<image001.jpg>

300 Crescent Court | Suite 700 | Dallas, Texas 75201
O: 972.628.4117 | C: 469.877.6440 | F: 972.628.4147
dsauter@nexpointadvisors.com | www.NexPointGroup.com

DISCLAIMER- This email is intended for the recipient(s) only and should not be copied or reproduced without explicit permission. The material provided herein is for informational purposes only and does not constitute an offer or commitment, a solicitation of an offer, or any advice or recommendation, to enter into or conclude any transaction. It may contain confidential, proprietary or legally privileged information. If you receive this message in error, please immediately delete it.

PRIVILEGE WARNING: The sender or recipient of this message is a member of the legal department at Highland Capital Management. This message and any attachments hereto may constitute attorney work product or be protected by the attorney-client privilege. Do not disclose this message or any attachments hereto without prior consent of a member of the legal department at Highland Capital Management.

<Acis - Release (EXECUTION VERSION).pdf>



CLERK, U.S. BANKRUPTCY COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS

ENTERED

THE DATE OF ENTRY IS ON
THE COURT'S DOCKET

The following constitutes the ruling of the court and has the force and effect therein described.

Signed January 11, 2021


United States Bankruptcy Judge

**IN THE UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS
DALLAS DIVISION**

In re:

HIGHLAND CAPITAL MANAGEMENT, L.P.,¹

Debtor.

HIGHLAND CAPITAL MANAGEMENT, L.P.,

Plaintiff,

vs.

JAMES D. DONDERO,

Defendant.

§ Chapter 11
§
§ Case No. 19-34054-sgj11
§
§
§ Adversary Proceeding No.
§
§ No. 20-03190-sgj
§
§
§
§

**ORDER GRANTING DEBTOR'S MOTION FOR A PRELIMINARY INJUNCTION
AGAINST JAMES DONDERO**

This matter having come before the Court on *Plaintiff Highland Capital Management,*

¹ The Debtor's last four digits of its taxpayer identification number are (6725). The headquarters and service address for the above-captioned Debtor is 300 Crescent Court, Suite 700, Dallas, TX 75201.

L.P.’s Emergency Motion for a Temporary Restraining Order and Preliminary Injunction against Mr. James Dondero [Adv. Pro. Docket No. 2] (the “Motion”), filed by Highland Capital Management, L.P., the debtor and debtor-in-possession (the “Debtor”) in the above-captioned chapter 11 case (the “Bankruptcy Case”), and the plaintiff in the above-captioned adversary proceeding (the “Adversary Proceeding”); and this Court having considered (a) the Motion, (b) *Plaintiff Highland Capital Management, L.P.’s Verified Original Complaint for Injunctive Relief* [Adv. Pro. Docket No. 1] (the “Complaint”), (c) the arguments and law cited in the *Debtor’s Amended Memorandum of Law in Support of its Motion for a Temporary Restraining Order and Preliminary Injunction against Mr. James Dondero* [Adv. Pro. Docket No. 3] (the “Memorandum of Law,” and together with the Motion and Complaint, the “Debtor’s Papers”), (d) *James Dondero’s Response in Opposition to Debtor’s Motion for a Preliminary Injunction* [Adv. Pro. Docket No. 52] (the “Opposition”) filed by James Dondero, (e) the testimonial and documentary evidence admitted into evidence during the hearing held on January 8, 2021 (the “Hearing”), including assessing the credibility of Mr. James Dondero, (f) the arguments made during the Hearing, and (g) all prior proceedings relating to the Motion, including the December 10, 2020 hearing on the *Debtor’s Motion for a Temporary Restraining Order and Preliminary Injunction against James Dondero* [Adv. Pro. Docket No. 6] (the “TRO Hearing”); and this Court having jurisdiction over this matter pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §§ 157 and 1334; and this Court having found that this is a core proceeding pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 157(b)(2); and this Court having found that venue of this proceeding and the Motion in this District is proper pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §§ 1408 and 1409; and this Court having found that injunctive relief is warranted under sections 105(a) and 362(a) of the Bankruptcy Code and that the relief requested in the Motion is in the best interests of the Debtor’s estate, its creditors, and other parties-in-interest;

and this Court having found that the Debtor's notice of the Motion and opportunity for a hearing on the Motion were appropriate and that no other notice need be provided; and this Court having determined that the legal and factual bases set forth in the Debtor's Papers, and the evidence submitted in support thereof, establish good cause for the relief granted herein, and that (1) such relief is necessary to avoid immediate and irreparable harm to the Debtor's estate and reorganization process; (2) the Debtor is likely to succeed on the merits of its underlying claim for injunctive relief; (3) the balance of the equities tip in the Debtor's favor; and (4) such relief serves the public interest; and upon all of the proceedings had before this Court; and after due deliberation and sufficient cause appearing therefor and for the reasons set forth in the record on this Motion, it is **HEREBY ORDERED THAT:**

1. The Motion is **GRANTED** as set forth herein.
2. James Dondero is preliminarily enjoined and restrained from (a) communicating (whether orally, in writing, or otherwise), directly or indirectly, with any Board member unless Mr. Dondero's counsel and counsel for the Debtor are included in any such communication; (b) making any express or implied threats of any nature against the Debtor or any of its directors, officers, employees, professionals, or agents, in whatever capacity they are acting; (c) communicating with any of the Debtor's employees, except as it specifically relates to shared services currently provided to affiliates owned or controlled by Mr. Dondero; (d) interfering with or otherwise impeding, directly or indirectly, the Debtor's business, including but not limited to the Debtor's decisions concerning its operations, management, treatment of claims, disposition of assets owned, controlled or managed by the Debtor, and the pursuit of the Plan or any

alternative to the Plan; and (e) otherwise violating section 362(a) of the Bankruptcy Code (collectively, the “Prohibited Conduct”).²

3. James Dondero is further preliminarily enjoined and restrained from causing, encouraging, or conspiring with (a) any entity owned or controlled by him, and/or (b) any person or entity acting with him or on his behalf, to, directly or indirectly, engage in any Prohibited Conduct.

4. James Dondero is further preliminarily enjoined and restrained from communicating (in person, telephonically, by e-mail, text message or otherwise) with Scott Ellington and/or Isaac Leventon, unless otherwise ordered by the Court.

5. James Dondero is further preliminarily enjoined and restrained from physically entering, or virtually entering through the Debtor’s computer, email, or information systems, the Debtor’s offices located at Crescent Court in Dallas, Texas, or any other offices or facilities owned or leased by the Debtor, regardless of any agreements, subleases, or otherwise, held by the Debtor’s affiliates or entities owned or controlled by Mr. Dondero, without the prior written permission of Debtor’s counsel made to Mr. Dondero’s counsel. If Mr. Dondero enters the Debtor’s office or other facilities or systems without such permission, such entrance will constitute trespass.

6. James Dondero is ordered to attend all future hearings in this Bankruptcy Case by Webex (or whatever other video platform is utilized by the Court), unless otherwise ordered by the Court.

7. This Order shall remain in effect until the date that any plan of reorganization or liquidation resolving the Debtor’s case becomes effective, unless otherwise ordered by the Court.

² For the avoidance of doubt, this Order does not enjoin or restrain Mr. Dondero from (1) seeking judicial relief upon proper notice or from objecting to any motion filed in this Bankruptcy Case, or (2) communicating with the committee of unsecured creditors (the “UCC”) and its professionals regarding a pot plan.

8. All objections to the Motion are overruled in their entirety.
9. The Court shall retain exclusive jurisdiction with respect to all matters arising from or relating to the implementation, interpretation, and enforcement of this Order.

END OF ORDER

Acknowledgement from HCMLP

April 15, 2019

Reference is hereby made to certain outstanding amounts loaned from HIGHLAND CAPITAL MANAGEMENT, L.P. ("HCMLP") to HIGHLAND CAPITAL MANAGEMENT FUND ADVISORS, L.P. ("HCMF") for funding of HCMF's ongoing operations, which are payable on demand and remained outstanding on December 31, 2018 and as of the date hereof.

HCMF expects that it may be unable to repay such amounts should they become due, for the period commencing today and continuing through May 31, 2021.

HCMLP hereby agrees to not demand payment on amounts owed by HCMF prior to May 31, 2021.

Highland Capital Management, L.P.

By: Strand Advisors, Inc., its general partner

By:  _____

Acknowledged By:

Highland Capital Management Fund Advisors, L.P.

By: Strand XVI, Inc., its general partner

By:  _____

EXHIBIT 4

EXHIBIT 182



DATE: May 28, 2019

TO: The Board of Trustees (the "Board") of Highland Global Allocation Fund (the "Fund")

FROM: Highland Capital Management Fund Advisors, L.P. ("HCMFA" or the "Adviser")

RE: Resolution of the Fund's Net Asset Value ("NAV") Error

This memorandum summarizes the final resolution of the Fund's NAV error related to its TerreStar Corporation ("TerreStar") equity holding. In connection with the Fund's conversion from an open-end fund to a closed-end fund (the "Conversion") on February 13, 2019, the Office of the Chief Accountant ("OCA") of the SEC reviewed the Adviser's fair valuation of TerreStar equity, in particular the application of Financial Accounting Standards Board Accounting Standards Update 2011-4, Topic 820, Fair Value Measurement ("ASC 820") to two transactions in TerreStar equity that occurred in March 2018 (the "March Transactions"). The OCA provided its feedback during an exit call on February 8, 2019 and subsequently confirmed no comments to the Adviser's confirmation of understanding letter on February 14, 2019.

The Adviser and Houlihan Lokey, an independent third party expert valuation consultant approved by the Board, initially determined that the March Transactions were "non-orderly" and should be given "zero weighting" for purposes of determining fair value. As reflected in the consultation, the Adviser ultimately determined that both March Transactions should be classified as "orderly." The fair valuation methodology adopted, as addressed in the consultation, weights inputs and does not reflect last sales transaction pricing exclusively in determining fair value. The "orderly" determination and adoption of the weighted fair valuation methodology resulted in NAV errors in the Fund (the "NAV Error").

After incorporation of the updated valuation into the Fund's NAV, the gross NAV Error, excluding interest, the advisory fee rebate, and processing costs, amounted to approximately \$6.1 million of loss to the Fund and approximately \$1.4 million of losses to Shareholders (a total loss of approximately \$7.5 million) over the period between March 18, 2018 and January 19, 2019 (the "NAV Restatement Period").

The Fund was made whole through a \$5,186,496 payment on February 15, 2019, and a \$2,398,842 payment on May 2, 2019. A detailed breakdown of the NAV Error and the make whole payments is set forth below. Shareholder reprocessing and reimbursement are in progress with the Fund's prior transfer agent, DST Systems, Inc. (as transfer agent to the open-end fund), and given detailed omnibus account information has not yet been obtained the estimated make whole payments are subject to change. A representative of the Adviser will provide the Board with an update on the process during the May 28, 2019 Board meeting.

NAV Error Breakdown and Make Whole Payments

	Transaction Date(s)	Loss to Fund	Estimated Loss to Shareholders ³	Totals
Estimated Net Loss	3/14/18 thru 1/7/19	(6,068,851)	(1,373,272)	(7,442,123)
Processing, Fees, Interest	3/14/18 thru 1/7/19	(375,000)	-	(375,000)
Insurance Proceeds	2/15/2019	3,566,248	1,373,272	4,939,520
Insurance deductible paid by Adviser	2/15/2019	246,976	-	246,976
Management fee offset	4/1/2019	47,000	-	47,000
Additional payment from Adviser	5/2/2019	2,339,627 ²	-	2,339,627
Reimbursement of Processing costs from Adviser	- ¹	244,000	-	244,000
Total		-	-	-

Supplemental Numerical Update

Additional estimated loss to fund and shareholders	1/8/19 thru 1/28/19 ⁵	(19,789)
Additional processing, management fees, and interest	Note 4	(39,426)
Additional payment from Adviser	5/2/2019	59,215
Total additional payment from Adviser⁶	5/2/2019	2,398,842

Notes

1 - Expected to be incurred thru 12/31/19, and will be reimbursed by Adviser as incurred. To date no invoices have been billed or paid, but upon receipt of a future invoice, the Adviser will promptly pay.

2 - Includes \$2,255,628 of previously outstanding balance, and \$84,000 of interest calculated through 1/7/19, which was the "as of date" used for the calculations in the OCA submission.

3 - Represents the estimated losses to shareholder subscribing into the fund during the NAV Restatement Period and estimated losses to be determined after reprocessing individual capital activity that was held in Omnibus accounts.

4 - Proposal from service provider was higher than original estimate, and includes interest thru date of final payment made by Adviser.

5 - This includes the calculations subsequent to 1/7/19 (which was the "as of date" used for the calculations in the OCA submission) "through date" 1/28/19, which the final date in which the revised mark was fully reflected in the NAV.

6 - Includes \$2,339,627 and \$59,215 of Additional payments from Adviser

EXHIBIT 183

INTENTIONALLY

OMITTED

EXHIBIT 184

D. Michael Lynn
 State Bar I.D. No. 12736500
 John Y. Bonds, III
 State Bar I.D. No. 02589100
 Clay M. Taylor
 State Bar I.D. No. 24033261
 Bryan C. Assink
 State Bar I.D. No. 24089009
 BONDS ELLIS EPPICH SCHAFER JONES LLP
 420 Throckmorton Street, Suite 1000
 Fort Worth, Texas 76102
 (817) 405-6900 telephone
 (817) 405-6902 facsimile

ATTORNEYS FOR DEFENDANT JAMES DONDERO

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
 FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS
 DALLAS DIVISION**

In re:	§	Case No. 19-34054
	§	
HIGHLAND CAPITAL MANAGEMENT, L.P.	§	Chapter 11
	§	
Debtor.	§	

HIGHLAND CAPITAL MANAGEMENT, L.P.,	§	
	§	
Plaintiff.	§	
	§	
v.	§	Adversary No. 21-03003
	§	
JAMES D. DONDERO,	§	
	§	
Defendant.	§	

DEFENDANT JAMES DONDERO’S RULE 26 INITIAL DISCLOSURES

TO: Plaintiff Highland Capital Management, L.P., by and through its attorneys of record, John Morris, Pachulski Stang Ziehl & Jones LLP, 10100 Santa Monica Blvd., 13th Floor, Los Angeles, CA 90067.

Pursuant to Rule 26(a)(1) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, made applicable to this proceeding through Rule 7026 of the Federal Rules of Bankruptcy Procedure, Defendant James

Dondero (“Dondero” or “Defendant”) makes the following initial disclosures to Plaintiff Highland Capital Management, L.P. (“Plaintiff” or “Debtor”).¹

- 1. The names, and, if known, the addresses, and telephone numbers of individuals likely to have discoverable information, along with the subjects of that information are listed below. Defendant reserves the right to amend and/or supplement these disclosures.**

ANSWER:

James D. Dondero
c/o D. Michael Lynn
Clay M. Taylor
Bryan C. Assink
BONDS ELLIS EPPICH SCHAFFER JONES LLP
420 Throckmorton Street, Suite 1000
Fort Worth, Texas 76102
Attorneys for Defendant

Dondero may have knowledge regarding the claims, defenses, and factual circumstances at issue in the Debtor’s complaint and this adversary proceeding, including, without limitation, the terms of the promissory notes, the drafting and execution of the notes, the agreement of the Debtor to not collect on the notes upon fulfillment of conditions subsequent, the purpose and intent of the notes, the Debtor’s prior use of forgivable loans, and Dondero’s compensation from the Debtor during his employment.

Highland Capital Management, L.P. and certain of its current employees
c/o John Morris
PACHULSKI STANG ZIEHL & JONES LLP
10100 Santa Monica Blvd., 13th Floor
Los Angeles, CA 90067
Attorneys for Plaintiff

Debtor and certain of its current employees, including potentially Thomas Surgent, David Klos, and Kristen Hendrix, may have knowledge regarding the claims, defenses, and factual circumstances at issue in the Debtor’s complaint and Dondero’s defenses to the allegations in the complaint, including the circumstances surrounding the execution of the notes and related transfers, the agreement of the Debtor to not collect on the notes upon fulfillment of conditions

¹ Defendant makes these disclosures subject in all respects to his Motion for Withdrawal of the Reference [Adv. Dkt. No. 21] and the Motion to Stay Pending the Motion to Withdraw the Reference of Plaintiff’s Complaint [Adv. Dkt. No. 22] filed on April 15, 2021. Defendant does not waive, but instead hereby preserves, his right to a jury trial and all rights and requests for relief asserted in the motions. Defendant does not consent to the Bankruptcy Court determining this proceeding or entering final orders or judgments in this proceeding. Instead, Defendant requests that the reference be withdrawn and that the District Court adjudicate this proceeding.

subsequent, the Debtor's prior use of forgivable loans, and Dondero's compensation from the Debtor during his employment.

Brian Collins, former employee of the Debtor

Tel: 213-550-4538

As a former employee, he may have knowledge regarding the claims, defenses, and factual circumstances at issue in the Debtor's complaint and this adversary proceeding, including, without limitation, the promissory notes, the circumstances surrounding the preparation and/or execution of the notes and related transfers, the agreement of the Debtor to not collect on the notes upon fulfillment of conditions subsequent, the Debtor's prior use of forgivable loans, compensation of Debtor employees, and Dondero's compensation from the Debtor during his employment.

Amy Theriot, former employee of the Debtor

Tel: 214-893-5352

As a former employee, she may have knowledge regarding the claims, defenses, and factual circumstances at issue in the Debtor's complaint and this adversary proceeding, including, without limitation, the promissory notes, the circumstances surrounding the preparation and/or execution of the notes and related transfers, the agreement of the Debtor to not collect on the notes upon fulfillment of conditions subsequent, the Debtor's prior use of forgivable loans, compensation of Debtor employees, and Dondero's compensation from the Debtor during his employment.

Mark Okada, former employee of the Debtor

Tel: 975-989-1000

As a former employee, he may have knowledge regarding the claims, defenses, and factual circumstances at issue in the Debtor's complaint and this adversary proceeding, including, without limitation, the promissory notes, the circumstances surrounding the preparation and/or execution of the notes and related transfers, the agreement of the Debtor to not collect on the notes upon fulfillment of conditions subsequent, the Debtor's prior use of forgivable loans, compensation of Debtor employees, and Dondero's compensation from the Debtor during his employment.

Scott Ellington, former employee of the Debtor

c/o Frances Smith

Ross & Smith PC

700 N. Pearl Street, Suite 1610

Dallas, TX 75201

As a former employee, he may have knowledge regarding the claims, defenses, and factual circumstances at issue in the Debtor's complaint and this adversary proceeding, including, without limitation, the promissory notes, the circumstances surrounding the preparation and/or execution

of the notes and related transfers, the agreement of the Debtor to not collect on the notes upon fulfillment of conditions subsequent, the Debtor's prior use of forgivable loans, compensation of Debtor employees, and Dondero's compensation from the Debtor during his employment.

Frank Waterhouse, former employee of the Debtor

c/o Frances Smith
Ross & Smith PC
700 N. Pearl Street, Suite 1610
Dallas, TX 75201

As a former employee, he may have knowledge regarding the promissory notes, the circumstances surrounding the execution of the notes and related transfers, the agreement of the Debtor to not collect on the notes upon fulfillment of conditions subsequent, the Debtor's prior use of forgivable loans, compensation of Debtor employees, and Dondero's compensation from the Debtor during his employment.

John Honis, employee of Rand Advisors

Tel: 214-335-7969

As an employee of Rand Advisors, he may have knowledge regarding the Debtor's prior use of forgivable loans.

Jack Yang, former employee of the Debtor

Tel: 646-387-2351

As a former employee, he may have knowledge regarding the Debtor's prior use of forgivable loans.

Paul Adkins, former employee of the Debtor

Tel: +65 9728 0599

As a former employee, he may have knowledge regarding the Debtor's prior use of forgivable loans.

Pat Daugherty, former employee of the Debtor

c/o Jason Kathman
Spencer Fane LLP
2200 Ross Avenue, Suite 4800
Dallas, TX 75201

As a former employee, he may have knowledge regarding the Debtor's prior use of forgivable loans.

Tim Lawler, former employee of the Debtor

Tel: 847-305-3013

As a former employee, he may have knowledge regarding the Debtor's prior use of forgivable loans.

Appu Mundassery, former employee of the Debtor

As a former employee, he may have knowledge regarding the Debtor's prior use of forgivable loans.

Mike Hurley, former employee of the Debtor

Tel: 775-750-8921

As a former employee, he may have knowledge regarding the Debtor's prior use of forgivable loans.

Gibran Mahmud, former employee of the Debtor

Tel: 972-740-0018

As a former employee, he may have knowledge regarding the Debtor's prior use of forgivable loans.

2. A copy or a description by category and location, of all documents, electronically stored information, and tangible things that the disclosing party has in its possession, custody, or control and may use to support its claims or defenses.

ANSWER: Defendant may have documents and communications related to the following matters in his possession, custody, or control that he may use to support his claims or defenses. The inclusion of a general category of documents below does not mean that specific documents necessarily exist or that Defendant has such documents in his possession, custody, or control.

1. Documents and communications related to the allegations in the complaint and Dondero's defenses to the allegations in the complaint, including, without limitation, documents related to the terms of the promissory notes, the drafting and execution of the notes, the agreement of the Debtor to not collect on the notes upon fulfillment of conditions subsequent, the purpose and intent of the notes, the Debtor's prior use of forgivable loans, and Dondero's compensation from the Debtor during his employment.
2. Documents related to Dondero's personal tax returns.
3. Documents related to tax loan(s) made by the Debtor to Dondero and such tax amounts incurred related to federal partnership tax.
4. Documents and/or communications related to Dondero's compensation during his employment at Highland.
5. Any and all pleadings filed in this matter and the main bankruptcy case.

3. A computation of each category of damages claimed by the disclosing party, who must also make available for inspection and copying as under Rule 34 the documents or other evidentiary material, unless privileged or protected from disclosure, on which each computation is based, including materials bearing on the nature and extent of injuries suffered.

ANSWER:

Defendant is not seeking actual damages at this time.

4. For inspection and copying as under Rule 34, any insurance agreement under which an insurance business may be liable to satisfy all or part of a possible judgment in the action or to indemnify or reimburse for payments made to satisfy the judgment.

ANSWER:

No such insurance agreements known.

Reservation of Rights

Defendant makes these disclosures subject in all respects to his Motion for Withdrawal of the Reference [Adv. Dkt. No. 21] and Motion to Stay Pending the Motion to Withdraw the Reference of Plaintiff's Complaint [Adv. Dkt. No. 22] filed on April 15, 2021. Defendant does not waive, but hereby preserves, his right to a jury trial and all additional rights and relief available as asserted in the motions.

The Defendant's investigation is ongoing, and he reserves the right to further amend, modify and/or supplement these initial disclosures as provided in Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 26(e) if warranted and to the extent additional disclosures are not mooted or made redundant by information made known during the discovery process or in writing. In addition, the Defendant makes these initial disclosures without waiving but expressly preserving: (a) his right to a jury trial; (b) his right to have this proceeding determined by the District Court; (c) his right to object to the entry of any final orders or final judgments by the Bankruptcy Court in this proceeding; (d) the right to object to any discovery requests or to the admissibility of evidence on the grounds of privilege, work product, relevance, materiality, or any other proper ground; and (e) the right to object to the use of any information provided in or derived from these initial disclosures for any purpose in this action.

Dated: April 15, 2021

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ Bryan C. Assink

D. Michael Lynn
State Bar I.D. No. 12736500
John Y. Bonds, III
State Bar I.D. No. 02589100
Clay M. Taylor
State Bar I.D. No. 24033261
Bryan C. Assink
State Bar I.D. No. 24089009
BONDS ELLIS EPPICH SCHAFER JONES LLP
420 Throckmorton Street, Suite 1000
Fort Worth, Texas 76102
(817) 405-6900 telephone
(817) 405-6902 facsimile
Email: michael.lynn@bondsellis.com
Email: john@bondsellis.com
Email: clay.taylor@bondsellis.com
Email: bryan.assink@bondsellis.com

ATTORNEYS FOR DEFENDANT JAMES
DONDERO

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I, the undersigned, hereby certify that, on April 15, 2021, a true and correct copy of the foregoing Rule 26 initial disclosure was served via email on counsel for the Plaintiff as listed below.

Jeff Pomerantz
Ira Kharasch
John Morris
Greg Demo
Hayley Winograd
PACHULSKI STANG ZIEHL & JONES LLP
10100 Santa Monica Blvd., 13th Floor
Los Angeles, CA 90067
Email: jpomerantz@pszjlaw.com
ikharasch@pszjlaw.com
jmorris@pszjlaw.com
gdemo@pszjlaw.com
hwinograd@pszjlaw.com

/s/ Bryan C. Assink

Bryan C. Assink

EXHIBIT 185

PACHULSKI STANG ZIEHL & JONES LLP

Jeffrey N. Pomerantz (CA Bar No.143717) (*admitted pro hac vice*)
Ira D. Kharasch (CA Bar No. 109084) (*admitted pro hac vice*)
John A. Morris (NY Bar No. 2405397) (*admitted pro hac vice*)
Gregory V. Demo (NY Bar No. 5371992) (*admitted pro hac vice*)
Hayley R. Winograd (NY Bar No. 5612569) (*admitted pro hac vice*)
10100 Santa Monica Blvd., 13th Floor
Los Angeles, CA 90067
Telephone: (310) 277-6910
Facsimile: (310) 201-0760

HAYWARD PLLC

Melissa S. Hayward
Texas Bar No. 24044908
MHayward@HaywardFirm.com
Zachery Z. Annable
Texas Bar No. 24053075
ZAnnable@HaywardFirm.com
10501 N. Central Expy, Ste. 106
Dallas, Texas 75231
Tel: (972) 755-7100
Fax: (972) 755-7110

Counsel for Highland Capital Management, L.P.

**IN THE UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS
DALLAS DIVISION**

In re:

HIGHLAND CAPITAL MANAGEMENT, L.P.,¹

Reorganized Debtor.

HIGHLAND CAPITAL MANAGEMENT, L.P.,

Plaintiff,

vs.

HIGHLAND CAPITAL MANAGEMENT FUND
ADVISORS, L.P.,

Defendant.

§
§ Chapter 11
§
§ Case No. 19-34054-sgj11
§
§
§
§ Adversary Proceeding No.
§
§ 21-03004-sgj
§
§
§
§
§

¹ The Reorganized Debtor's last four digits of its taxpayer identification number are (6725). The headquarters and service address for the above-captioned Reorganized Debtor is 100 Cresce



193405421113000000000013

Appx. 02992

Case 21-03004-sgj Doc 84 Filed 11/30/21 Entered 11/30/21 17:53:40 Page 2 of 7

**PLAINTIFF’S THIRD AMENDED NOTICE OF RULE 30(B)(6) DEPOSITION
TO HIGHLAND CAPITAL MANAGEMENT FUND ADVISORS, L.P.**

PLEASE TAKE NOTICE that, pursuant to Rule 30(b)(6) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, made applicable herein pursuant to Rules 7030 and 9014 of the Federal Rules of Bankruptcy Procedure, Highland Capital Management, L.P., the plaintiff in the above-referenced adversary proceeding in the above-captioned chapter 11 case, shall take the deposition of Highland Capital Management Fund Advisors, L.P. (“HCMFA”) by the person(s) most qualified to testify on HCMFA’s behalf with respect to the topics described in **Exhibit A** attached hereto on **December 1, 2021, commencing at 10:00 a.m. Central Time** or at such other day and time as the Plaintiff may agree in writing. The deposition will be taken under oath before a notary public or other person authorized by law to administer oaths and will be visually recorded by video or otherwise.

The deposition will be taken remotely via an online platform due to the coronavirus pandemic such that no one will need to be in the same location as anyone else in order to participate in the deposition and by use of Interactive Realtime.

[REMAINDER OF PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK]

Case 21-03004-sgj Doc 84 Filed 11/30/21 Entered 11/30/21 17:53:40 Page 3 of 7

Dated: November 30, 2021.

PACHULSKI STANG ZIEHL & JONES LLP

/s/ John A. Morris

Jeffrey N. Pomerantz (CA Bar No. 143717)

Ira D. Kharasch (CA Bar No. 109084)

John A. Morris (NY Bar No. 2405397)

Gregory V. Demo (NY Bar No. 5371992)

10100 Santa Monica Blvd., 13th Floor

Los Angeles, CA 90067

Telephone: (310) 277-6910

Facsimile: (310) 201-0760

E-mail: jpomerantz@pszjlaw.com

ikharasch@pszjlaw.com

jmorris@pszjlaw.com

gdemo@pszjlaw.com

-and-

HAYWARD PLLC

Melissa S. Hayward

Texas Bar No. 24044908

MHayward@HaywardFirm.com

Zachery Z. Annable

Texas Bar No. 24053075

ZAnnable@HaywardFirm.com

10501 N. Central Expy, Ste. 106

Dallas, Texas 75231

Tel: (972) 755-7100

Fax: (972) 755-7110

Counsel for Highland Capital Management, L.P.

EXHIBIT A

DEFINITIONS

1. “Amended Answer” means *Defendant’s Amended Answer* lodged in the above-referenced adversary proceeding at Docket No. 48.
2. “Bankruptcy Case” refers to the above-referenced bankruptcy case styled as *In re Highland Capital Management, L.P.*, Case No. 19-34054-sgj11.
3. “Communications” means the transmittal of information (in the form of facts, ideas, inquiries, or otherwise) and includes all oral and written communications of any nature, type or kind including, but not limited to, any ESI (and any attachments thereto), Documents, telephone conversations, text messages, discussions, meetings, facsimiles, e-mails, pagers, memoranda, and any other medium through which any information is conveyed or transmitted.
4. “Concerning” means and includes relating to, constituting, defining, evidencing, mentioning, containing, describing, discussing, embodying, reflecting, edifying, analyzing, stating, referring to, dealing with, or in any way pertaining to the subject matter.
5. “Discovery Requests” means (i) the *Debtor’s First Requests for Admission Directed to Highland Capital Management Fund Advisors, L.P.*, (ii) the *Debtor’s First Request for Production of Documents Directed to Highland Capital Management Fund Advisors, L.P.*, and (iii) the *Debtor’s First Interrogatories Directed to Highland Capital Management Fund Advisors, L.P.*
6. “Document” means and includes all written, recorded, transcribed or graphic matter of every nature, type and kind, however and by whoever produced, reproduced, disseminated or made. This includes, but is not limited to, Communications, ESI, “writings” as defined by Rule 1001 of the Federal Rules of Evidence, copies or drafts, and any tangible or

intangible thing or item that contains any information. Any Document that contains any comment, notation, addition, insertion or marking of any type or kind which is not part of another Document, is to be considered a separate Document.

7. “Exhibits” refers to each of the documents identified as Exhibits 28-66 on *Debtor’s Amended Witness and Exhibit List with Respect to Hearing to Be Held on May 25, 2021* lodged in the above-referenced adversary proceeding at Docket No. 35.

8. “HGAF” shall have the meaning ascribed to that term in paragraph 38 of the Amended Answer.

9. “Highland” means Highland Capital Management, L.P.

10. “Insurance Claim” means any claim that You filed for insurance coverage Concerning the NAV Error.

11. “Motion to Amend” means *Defendant’s Motion for Leave to Amend Answer* lodged in the above-referenced adversary proceeding at Docket No. 32.

12. “NAV Error” means the error made in calculating the net asset value of the equity interests HGAF held in TerreStar that were sold in March 2018.

13. “Notes” shall have the meaning ascribed to that term in paragraph 15 of the *Complaint for (I) Breach of Contract and (II) Turnover of Property of the Debtor’s Estate* lodged in the above-referenced adversary proceeding at Docket No. 1.

14. “Original Answer” means *Defendant’s Original Answer* lodged in the above-referenced adversary proceeding at Docket No. 6.

15. “Retail Board” means any board of trustees or directors of any fund to which You provide advisory services.

16. “Sauter Declaration” means the *Declaration of Dennis C. Sauter, Jr.* lodged in the above-referenced adversary proceeding at Docket No. 32-1.

17. “You” or “Your” means Highland Capital Management Fund Advisors, L.P., and anyone authorized to act on its behalf.

Rule 30(b)(6) Topics

Topic No. 1:

Your Original Answer.

Topic No. 2:

Your Amended Answer

Topic No. 3:

Each Affirmative Defense asserted in Your Amended Answer, including but not limited to all facts and circumstances, Communications, and Documents Concerning each Affirmative Defense. *See* Answer ¶¶ 38-47.

Topic No. 4:

The Notes, including but not limited to (a) the negotiation of the Notes, (b) the terms of the Notes, (c) Communications Concerning the Notes, (d) any payments of principal or interest made by You or on Your behalf with respect to the Notes, (e) the use of the proceeds of the Notes, (f) Your communications with Your outside auditors Concerning the Notes and the obligations thereunder, and (g) any agreements Concerning the Notes.

Topic No. 5:

The Exhibits.

Topic No. 6:

The Motion to Amend.

Topic No. 7:

The Sauter Declaration.

Topic No. 8:

Any Insurance Claim that You filed, including but not limited to: (a) any proceeds You received on account of any Insurance Claim; (b) any deductible paid by You in connection with any Insurance Claim; (c) the date You received any insurance proceeds on account of any Insurance Claim; (d) the use of the proceeds from any Insurance Claim; and (e) any Communications with any insurance carrier that processed any Insurance Claim.

Topic No. 9:

Any “consent fee” paid by You in April or May 2019, including the amount, date of payment, and source of funding for any such “consent fee.”

Topic No. 10:

Your accounting for (a) the \$2.4 million transferred from Highland to You on May 2, 2019, and (b) the \$5 million transferred from Highland to You on May 3, 2019.

Topic No. 11:

Communications in 2020 with any Retail Board concerning any amounts due and owing by You to Highland, including but not limited to the disclosures You made to any Retail Board in October 2020.

Topic No. 12:

All Communications that You made in the Bankruptcy Case Concerning the Notes, including in any pleading, court filing, or argument.

Topic No. 13:

The identity (including the title or position) of each of Your officer(s), director(s), direct and indirect owner(s), and employee(s) for the period January 1, 2018 through the present.

Topic No. 14:

Your responses to the Discovery Requests.

EXHIBIT 186

**INTENTIONALLY
OMITTED**

EXHIBIT 187

INTENTIONALLY

OMITTED

EXHIBIT 188

From: David Klos <DKlos@HighlandCapital.com>
Sent: Friday, February 02, 2018 2:16 PM
To: Corporate Accounting
Cc: Melissa Schroth
Subject: \$3.825mm to Jim

Blair,
Please set up \$3.825mm to go to Jim this afternoon. Frank has approved.

Drew, this is a new loan.

DAVID KLOS | CONTROLLER



300 Crescent Court | Suite 700 | Dallas, Texas 75201
C: 214.674.2926 | O: 972.419.4478 | F: 972.628.4147
dklos@highlandcapital.com | www.highlandcapital.com

EXHIBIT 189

From: wiremail@bbvacompass.com <wiremail@bbvacompass.com>
Sent: Friday, February 2, 2018 1:35 PM
To: Corporate Accounting <CorporateAccounting@hcmlp.com>
Subject: Compass Bank [Texas Bank Outgoing] Message ID:180202133456H400 Advice Code:TxBkOut

Compass Bank Wire Transfer Dept.
701 S 32nd Street
Birmingham, AL 35233

Outgoing Wire - Advice of Debit

Date: 2018-02-02 00:00:00 Wire Create Time 13:34:57

Account # :
Account Name : HIGHLAND CAPITAL MANAGEMENT LP
Amount : \$3,825,000.00
GFX Reference : 180202133456H400
Receiving Bank : 311973208
Recv BK Name : NEXBANK SSB

Originator : HIGHLAND CAPITAL MANAGEMENT LP

Beneficiary : James Dondero
Bene Acct # : [REDACTED] 884

Beneficiary Info (OBI):
2/2/2018 Loan

Reference for Beneficiary (RFB):

FED Reference Number (IMAD):
20180202F2QCZ60C002532

EXHIBIT 190

From: Blair Hillis <BHillis@HighlandCapital.com>
Sent: Wednesday, August 01, 2018 1:12 PM
To: David Klos; Corporate Accounting
Cc: Melissa Schroth
Subject: RE: \$2.5mm loan to Dondero

Funds have been transferred to Jim's account. Thanks!

Kind Regards,
Blair Roeber

From: David Klos
Sent: Wednesday, August 1, 2018 10:47 AM
To: Corporate Accounting
Cc: Melissa Schroth
Subject: \$2.5mm loan to Dondero

Jim has authorized a \$2.5mm loan from HCMLP to Dondero.

Blair, can you please set up this wire today?
Drew, can you please draw up loan docs for execution?

DAVID KLOS | CONTROLLER



300 Crescent Court | Suite 700 | Dallas, Texas 75201
C: 214.674.2926 | O: 972.419.4478 | F: 972.628.4147
dklos@highlandcapital.com | www.highlandcapital.com

EXHIBIT 191

From: Aigen, Michael P. [<mailto:michael.aigen@stinson.com>]

Sent: Friday, October 15, 2021 1:23 PM

To: John A. Morris <jmorris@pszilaw.com>

Cc: Jeff Pomerantz <jpomerantz@pszilaw.com>; Gregory V. Demo <GDemo@pszilaw.com>; Hayley R. Winograd <hwinograd@pszilaw.com>; 'zannable@haywardfirm.com' <zannable@haywardfirm.com>; Rukavina, Davor (drukavina@munsch.com) <drukavina@munsch.com>; Deitsch-Perez, Deborah R. <deborah.deitschperez@stinson.com>; 'ddraper@hellerdraper.com' <ddraper@hellerdraper.com>; Vasek, Julian (jvasek@munsch.com) <jvasek@munsch.com>; Berghman, Thomas (tberghman@munsch.com) <tberghman@munsch.com>; Clay Taylor (clay.taylor@bondsellis.com) <clay.taylor@bondsellis.com>; Bryan Assink (bryan.assink@bondsellis.com) <bryan.assink@bondsellis.com>; Douglas Draper <ddraper@hellerdraper.com>; elmsd@gtlaw.com

Subject: RE: HCMLP's Objections to Defendants' Rule 30(b)(6) Notice

John:

Defendants have the following objections to your corporate representative topics:

NexPoint, HCMS and HCRE

Topic 1: Your answer.

Defendants object to this topic because it is vague and not specific enough to allow Defendants to adequately prepare a witness. Subject to these objections, Defendants will provide a witness on this topic.

Topic 2: Each Affirmative Defense asserted in Your Answer, including but not limited to all facts and circumstances, Communications, and Documents Concerning each Affirmative Defense.

Defendants object to this topic because it is vague and not specific enough to allow Defendants to adequately prepare a witness. Subject to these objections, Defendants will provide a witness on this topic.

Topic 3: The Note, including but not limited to (a) the negotiation of the Note, (b) the terms of the Note, (c) Communications Concerning the Note, (d) any payments of principal or interest made by You or on Your behalf with respect to the Note; (e) the use of the proceeds of the Note, (f) Your communications with Your outside auditors Concerning the Note and the obligations thereunder, and (g) all agreements Concerning the Note.

Defendants object to the portion of this topic seeking information related to the use of the proceeds of the Note because that information is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Subject to these objections, Defendants will provide a witness on this topic.

Topic 4: Your responses to the Discovery Requests.

Defendants object to this topic because it is vague and not specific enough to allow Defendants to adequately prepare a witness. Defendants incorporate all objections made in their discovery responses. Subject to these objections, Defendants will provide a witness on this topic.

Dugaboy

Topic 2: Your authority to enter into the Alleged Agreement.

Defendant objects to this topic to the extent that it seeks privileged information and seeks legal conclusions. Subject to these objections, Defendant will provide a witness on this topic.

Topic 3: Ownership, beneficial ownership, and control of The Dugaboy Investment Trust.

Defendant objects to this topic because that information is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Subject to these objections, Defendant will provide a witness on this topic.

Topics 4-8: Other agreements other than the agreements at issue in these proceedings.

Defendant object to these topics because that information is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Subject to these objections, Defendant will provide a witness on these topics.

Topic 9: Your responses to the Discovery Requests.

Defendant objects to this topic because it is vague and not specific enough to allow Defendant to adequately prepare a witness. Defendant incorporates all objections made in its discovery responses. Subject to these objections, Defendant will provide a witness on this topic.

Michael P. Aigen

Partner

STINSON LLP

3102 Oak Lawn Avenue, Suite 777

Dallas, TX 75219

Direct: 214.560.2201 \ [Bio](#)

[STINSON.COM](#)

From: John A. Morris <jmorris@pszjlaw.com>

Sent: Tuesday, October 12, 2021 5:50 PM

To: Aigen, Michael P. <michael.aigen@stinson.com>

Cc: Jeff Pomerantz <jpomerantz@pszjlaw.com>; Gregory V. Demo <GDemo@pszjlaw.com>; Hayley R. Winograd <hwinograd@pszjlaw.com>; 'zannable@haywardfirm.com' <zannable@haywardfirm.com>; Rukavina, Davor (<drukavina@munsch.com>) <drukavina@munsch.com>; Deitsch-Perez, Deborah R. <deborah.deitschperez@stinson.com>; 'ddraper@hellerdraper.com' <ddraper@hellerdraper.com>; Vasek, Julian (<jvasek@munsch.com>) <jvasek@munsch.com>; Berghman, Thomas (<tberghman@munsch.com>) <tberghman@munsch.com>; Clay Taylor (<clay.taylor@bondsellis.com>) <clay.taylor@bondsellis.com>; Bryan Assink (<bryan.assink@bondsellis.com>) <bryan.assink@bondsellis.com>

Subject: HCMLP's Objections to Defendants' Rule 30(b)(6) Notice

Michael:

HCMLP has the following objections to the attached Rule 30(b)(6) notice:

HCMLP objects to Topic No. 2 (a) to the extent it calls for HCMLP to tender a witness to testify with precision to all principal, interest, and fees due under each Note that is the subject of the Complaints, and on the grounds that (b) HCMLP provided calculations of damages in its demand and default letters as well as its Complaints, (c) the categories of damages are all (i) unpaid principal, (ii) accrued but unpaid interest, and (iii) costs of collection, including reasonable attorneys' fees (the "Damages"), (d) based on the Notes and the documents produced proving HCMLP's costs of collection (which will be

supplemented from time to time to account for additional costs), the Defendants are just as easily capable of calculating the Damages at any moment in time as HCMLP, (e) it is unreasonable to expect any witness to specifically recall the precise Damages due under each Note, particularly when such Damages continue to increase every day.

Subject to those objections, HCMLP will tender a witness prepared to testify on Topic No. 2.

HCMLP objects to Topic No. 4 on the grounds that (a) the phrase “involved in” is vague and ambiguous, and (b) it assumes that any of the Notes were subject to “negotiations.”

Subject to those objections, HCMLP will tender a witness prepared to testify as to the identify of individuals it knows were involved in communications related to the execution and/or terms of the notes.

HCMLP objects to Topic No. 7 on the grounds that (a) it seeks “facts” that are solely within the Defendants’ knowledge, and that (b) Defendants’ defenses and affirmative defenses have materially changed over time, and are otherwise ambiguous or not specifically set forth in the Answers.

Subject to that objection, HCMLP will tender a witness prepared to testify as to facts that it knows of that relate to or concern the defenses and affirmative defenses specifically proffered by any of the Defendants.

HCMLP objects to Topics No. 9 on the grounds that (a) there is no time limitation, (b) the existence and terms of all affiliate loans, including all issues concerning forgiveness and forbearance, are set forth in detail in each of HCMLP’s audited financial statements for each year from 2008 through 2018 (including the sections concerning “Subsequent Events”), and HCMLP specifically refers Defendants to those audited financial statements, and (c) it is unreasonable to expect any witness to specifically recall the identity of all affiliated borrowers, and the amounts, dates, and terms of all loans made to affiliated borrowers, including whether, when, and to what extent any such affiliated loans were forgiven.

Subject to those objections, HCMLP will tender a witness prepared to testify as to loans it made to employees or officers that were forgiven, in whole or in part, during the period 2008 through the Petition Date.

HCMLP objects to Topics No. 10 on the grounds that (a) there is no time limitation, (b) the existence and terms of all affiliate loans, including all issues concerning forgiveness and forbearance, are set forth in detail in each of HCMLP’s audited financial statements for each year from 2008 through 2018 (including the sections concerning “Subsequent Events”), and HCMLP specifically refers Defendants to those audited financial statements, and (c) it is unreasonable to expect any witness to specifically recall the identity of all affiliated borrowers, and the amounts, dates, and terms of all loans made to affiliated borrowers, including whether, when, and to what extent any such affiliated loans were forgiven.

Subject to those objections, HCMLP will tender a witness prepared to testify as to loans it made to employees or officers that were forgiven, in whole or in part, during the period 2008 through the Petition Date.

HCMLP objects to Topics No. 11 on the grounds that (a) there is no time limitation, (b) documents concerning Mr. Dondero’s compensation for the period 2016 through 2020 (the “Compensation Documents”) have been or will be produced and HCMLP specifically refers Defendants to the Compensation Documents, and (c) it is unreasonable to expect any witness to specifically recall the specific amounts and components of Mr. Dondero’s compensation from 2016 and 2020.

Subject to those objections, HCMLP will tender a witness prepared to testify as to loans it made to employees or officers that were forgiven, in whole or in part, during the period 2008 through the Petition Date.

HCMLP objects to Topic No. 12 on the grounds that it is (a) overly broad, unduly burdensome, and not relevant to the claims or defenses in this adversary proceeding, and (b) none of the Defendants who served the attached Rule 30(b)(6) notice is or was a party to a Shared Services Agreement with HCMLP.

Based on the forgoing, HCMLP will not proffer a witness to testify as to Topic No. 12.

HCMLP objects to Topic Nos. 13, 14, 15, 16, and 17 to the extent those topics assume that HCMLP had any contractual or legal duty or obligation to take or refrain from taking the actions described therein.

Subject to those objections, and any additional objections referred to below, HCMLP will tender a witness prepared to testify on Topics 13, 14, 15, 16, and 17.

HCMLP objects to Topic No. 14 on the ground that the phrase “may have previously had any role” is speculative, vague, and ambiguous.

Subject to that objection, HCMLP will tender a witness prepared to testify as to those referenced employees who actually processed, made, facilitated or coordinated such payments, if any.

HCMLP objects to Topic No. 15 on the grounds that the phrase (a) “[a]ny communications or instructions that may have been given” is speculative, vague, and ambiguous, and (b) there is no time limitation.

Subject to those objections, HCMLP will tender a witness prepared to testify as to communications or instructions that were actually given from 2018 to the present, if any.

From: Aigen, Michael P. [<mailto:michael.aigen@stinson.com>]

Sent: Thursday, October 07, 2021 2:49 PM

To: Rukavina, Davor <drukavina@munsch.com>; 'zannable@haywardfirm.com' <zannable@haywardfirm.com>; John A. Morris <jmorris@pszilaw.com>; Deitsch-Perez, Deborah R. <deborah.deitschperez@stinson.com>; Douglas Draper <ddraper@hellerdraper.com>

Cc: Vasek, Julian <jvasek@munsch.com>; Berghman, Thomas <tberghman@munsch.com>; Clay Taylor <clay.taylor@bondsellis.com> <clay.taylor@bondsellis.com>; Bryan Assink <bryan.assink@bondsellis.com> <bryan.assink@bondsellis.com>; Jeff Pomerantz <jpomerantz@pszilaw.com>; Hayley R. Winograd <hwinograd@pszilaw.com>

Subject: RE: NexPoint Notice of 30(b)(6) to Debtor

Please see attached notice for the Seery/30B6 deposition.

Michael P. Aigen

Partner

STINSON LLP

3102 Oak Lawn Avenue, Suite 777

Dallas, TX 75219

Direct: 214.560.2201 \ [Bio](#)

STINSON.COM

This communication (including any attachments) is from a law firm and may contain confidential and/or privileged information. If it has been sent to you in error, please contact the sender for instructions concerning return or destruction, and do not use or disclose the contents to others.

From: Rukavina, Davor <drukavina@munsch.com>

Sent: Thursday, October 7, 2021 11:42 AM

To: 'zannable@haywardfirm.com' <zannable@haywardfirm.com>; John A. Morris <jmorris@pszilaw.com>; Deitsch-Perez, Deborah R. <deborah.deitschperez@stinson.com>; Douglas Draper <ddraper@hellerdraper.com>

Cc: Vasek, Julian <jvasek@munsch.com>; Berghman, Thomas <tberghman@munsch.com>; Aigen, Michael P. <michael.aigen@stinson.com>; Clay Taylor <clay.taylor@bondsellis.com> <clay.taylor@bondsellis.com>; Bryan Assink <bryan.assink@bondsellis.com> <bryan.assink@bondsellis.com>; Jeff Pomerantz <jpomerantz@pszilaw.com>; Hayley R.

Winograd <hwinograd@pszjlaw.com>

Subject: NexPoint Notice of 30(b)(6) to Debtor

External Email – Use Caution

Counsel, please see attached notice.

Thank you

Davor Rukavina, Esq.

Munsch Hardt Kopf & Harr, P.C.
500 N. Akard Street, Suite 3800 / Dallas, Texas 75201-6659

Direct: +1.214.855.7587 / drukavina@munsch.com / munsch.com

Notice: This email message is for the sole use of the intended recipient(s) and may contain confidential and privileged information. Any unauthorized review, use, disclosure or distribution is prohibited. Nothing contained in this message or in any attachment shall constitute a contract or electronic signature under the Electronic Signatures in Global and National Commerce Act, any version of the Uniform Electronic Transactions Act or any other statute governing electronic transactions.

EXHIBIT 192

IN THE UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS
DALLAS DIVISION

In re:)Chapter 11
)
HIGHLAND CAPITAL MANAGEMENT, LP,)
)Case No.
Debtor.)19-34054-SGJ-11
_____)
HIGHLAND CAPITAL MANAGEMENT, LP,)
)
Plaintiff,)
)
vs.)Advisory Proceeding No.
)21-03004
NEXPOINT ADVISORS, LP; JAMES)
DONDERO; NANCY DONDERO; and THE)
DUGABOY INVESTMENT TRUST,)
)
Defendants.)

REMOTE DEPOSITION OF
DUSTIN NORRIS
December 1, 2021

DUSTIN NORRIS, produced as a witness at the
instance of the Highland Capital Management, was
duly sworn and deposed in the above-styled and
numbered cause on December 1, 2021, from
10:01 a.m. CST to 3:25 p.m. CST, stenographically
reported, pursuant to the Federal Rules of Civil
Procedure and the provisions stated on the record.

Job Number: 203362
Reported by: Rebecca A. Graziano, CSR, RMR, CRR
Texas CSR 9306
California CSR 14407
Illinois CSR 084.004659

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 2</p> <p>1 A P P E A R A N C E S</p> <p>2 (all attendees appearing via remote videoconference)</p> <p>3</p> <p>4 REPRESENTING HIGHLAND CAPITAL MANAGEMENT, LP:</p> <p>5 John Morris, Esq.</p> <p>6 Hayley Winograd, Esq.</p> <p>7 PACHULSKI STANG ZIEHL & JONES LLP</p> <p>8 780 Third Avenue</p> <p>9 New York City, New York 10017</p> <p>10</p> <p>11 REPRESENTING NEXPOINT ADVISORS, LP:</p> <p>12 Davor Rukavina, Esq.</p> <p>13 MUNSCH HARDT KOPF & HARR, PC</p> <p>14 500 North Akard Street</p> <p>15 Dallas, Texas 75201</p> <p>16</p> <p>17 REPRESENTING JAMES DONDERO, NANCY DONDERO, HCRE,</p> <p>18 and HCMS:</p> <p>19 Michael Aigen, Esq.</p> <p>20 STINSON LLP</p> <p>21 3102 Oak Lawn Avenue</p> <p>22 Dallas, Texas 75219</p> <p>23</p> <p>24 ALSO PRESENT:</p> <p>25 La Asia Canty, Paralegal,</p> <p>Pachulski Stang Ziehl & Jones</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 3</p> <p>1 INDEX</p> <p>2 PAGE</p> <p>3</p> <p>4</p> <p>5 EXAMINATION BY MR. MORRIS..... 5</p> <p>6</p> <p>7</p> <p>8 EXHIBITS</p> <p>9 NUMBER DESCRIPTION PAGE</p> <p>10 Exhibit 185 Plaintiff's Third Amended Notice of</p> <p>11 Rule 30(b)(6) Deposition to</p> <p>12 Highland Capital Management Fund</p> <p>13 Advisors..... 7</p> <p>14</p> <p>15 PREVIOUSLY MARKED EXHIBITS</p> <p>16 NUMBER DESCRIPTION PAGE</p> <p>17 Exhibit 1 Complaint for (I) Breach of</p> <p>18 Contract and (II) Turnover of</p> <p>19 Property of the Debtor's Estate..... 38</p> <p>20 Exhibit 5 Defendant's Original Answer..... 29</p> <p>21 Exhibit 13 Defendant's Amended Answer..... 158</p> <p>22 Exhibit 36 Email Chain; Bates D-HCMFA290880</p> <p>23 through 290883..... 87</p> <p>24</p> <p>25</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 4</p> <p>1 PREVIOUSLY MARKED EXHIBITS</p> <p>2 NUMBER DESCRIPTION PAGE</p> <p>3 Exhibit 45 Highland Capital Management Fund</p> <p>4 Advisors, LP, Consolidated</p> <p>5 Financial Statements and</p> <p>6 Supplemental Information, 12/31/18;</p> <p>7 Bates D-CNL-002273 through 002296.... 46</p> <p>8 Exhibit 59 Supplemental 15(c) Info Request;</p> <p>9 Bates HCMFAS 000025 through 000031... 71</p> <p>10 Exhibit 147 BBVA Compass Bank Statement, Date</p> <p>11 Ending 5/31/19 (no Bates range)..... 51</p> <p>12 Exhibit 182 Memo Dated 5/28/19 (no Bates range).. 119</p> <p>13</p> <p>14</p> <p>15</p> <p>16</p> <p>17</p> <p>18</p> <p>19</p> <p>20</p> <p>21</p> <p>22</p> <p>23</p> <p>24</p> <p>25</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 5</p> <p>1 PROCEEDINGS</p> <p>2 (On the record at 10:01 a.m. CST)</p> <p>3 (Witness duly sworn.)</p> <p>4 DUSTIN NORRIS,</p> <p>5 being first duly sworn, testified as follows:</p> <p>6 EXAMINATION</p> <p>7 BY MR. MORRIS:</p> <p>8 Q Good morning, Mr. Norris. As you may</p> <p>9 recall, my name is John Morris. I'm an attorney</p> <p>10 at Pachulski Stang Ziehl & Jones, and we're</p> <p>11 counsel to the reorganized debtor known as</p> <p>12 Highland Capital Management, LP, and we're here</p> <p>13 for your deposition today.</p> <p>14 Do you understand that?</p> <p>15 A Yes, sir.</p> <p>16 Q And do you understand that you're being</p> <p>17 deposed today in your capacity as what's called a</p> <p>18 Rule 30(b)(6) witness on behalf of Highland</p> <p>19 Capital Management Fund Advisors, LP?</p> <p>20 A I do.</p> <p>21 Q Can we refer to Highland Capital</p> <p>22 Management Fund Advisors, LP, as "HCMFA"?</p> <p>23 A Yes, that works.</p> <p>24 Q And can we refer to Highland Capital</p> <p>25 Management, LP, as either "Highland" or "HCMLP"?</p>

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 6</p> <p>1 Dustin Norris</p> <p>2 A Yes.</p> <p>3 Q Okay. Are you aware that your answers</p> <p>4 today will bind HCMFA?</p> <p>5 A Generally, yes.</p> <p>6 Q Okay. Have you seen the notice that was</p> <p>7 served by Highland on HCMFA in connection with</p> <p>8 this deposition?</p> <p>9 A I have.</p> <p>10 Q Okay. I've -- I've examined you before;</p> <p>11 right?</p> <p>12 A Yes.</p> <p>13 Q Okay. So the rules are the exact same,</p> <p>14 and they are very simple. If I ask a question, I</p> <p>15 would ask you to refrain from answering until I've</p> <p>16 completed my question; is that fair?</p> <p>17 A Yes, it is. Thank you.</p> <p>18 Q And if I begin a question or respond</p> <p>19 before you've completed your answer, will you let</p> <p>20 me know that?</p> <p>21 A Yes.</p> <p>22 Q We're going to be putting documents up on</p> <p>23 the screen from time to time today. If at any</p> <p>24 time you believe you need to see other portions of</p> <p>25 the document in order to give complete and</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 7</p> <p>1 Dustin Norris</p> <p>2 accurate answers, will you let me know that?</p> <p>3 A Yes.</p> <p>4 Q If you need a break at any time, will you</p> <p>5 let me know that as well?</p> <p>6 A I will.</p> <p>7 Q Okay.</p> <p>8 MR. MORRIS: I would ask my</p> <p>9 colleague, Ms. Canty, to put up on the</p> <p>10 screen the Rule 30(b)(6) deposition</p> <p>11 notice.</p> <p>12 (Norris Exhibit 185 marked.)</p> <p>13 (Reporter discussion off the record.)</p> <p>14 MR. MORRIS: Okay. Asia, what</p> <p>15 exhibit number should we put on this</p> <p>16 document?</p> <p>17 MS. CANTY: 185.</p> <p>18 MR. MORRIS: Okay. Davor and</p> <p>19 Michael, this will be Exhibit 185.</p> <p>20 And if we can scroll down and show</p> <p>21 it to Mr. Norris.</p> <p>22 BY MR. MORRIS:</p> <p>23 Q Do you see that this is the plaintiff's</p> <p>24 third amended notice of deposition for today?</p> <p>25 MR. RUKAVINA: And just so you</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 8</p> <p>1 Dustin Norris</p> <p>2 know, John and Dustin, I did not send this</p> <p>3 to you, Dustin. All that it does is</p> <p>4 changes the time of today's deposition.</p> <p>5 It's identical to the last one that you</p> <p>6 did get.</p> <p>7 THE WITNESS: Okay. And I have the</p> <p>8 last one here with me as well.</p> <p>9 BY MR. MORRIS:</p> <p>10 Q Okay. So there's no -- I'll represent to</p> <p>11 you that there's no difference between the one</p> <p>12 that's on the screen and the one you have except</p> <p>13 that the one on the screen says "Third Amended</p> <p>14 Notice," and it was scheduled for 9:00 today.</p> <p>15 It's scheduled for 10:00 today, the -- the time</p> <p>16 that we're beginning.</p> <p>17 Do you have any other documents in</p> <p>18 front of you other than the deposition notice?</p> <p>19 A I do.</p> <p>20 Q What -- what other documents do you have</p> <p>21 before you?</p> <p>22 A Yeah. I have the original complaint I</p> <p>23 believe it's called -- forgive me if I call them</p> <p>24 the wrong items --</p> <p>25 Q Uh-huh.</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 9</p> <p>1 Dustin Norris</p> <p>2 A -- but the original complaint from HCMLP.</p> <p>3 I have the original answer response from HCMFA. I</p> <p>4 have the amended response. I have the declaration</p> <p>5 from Mr. Sauter. I have copies of the promissory</p> <p>6 notes. I have the shared services agreement. I</p> <p>7 have a -- incumbency certificates, which will help</p> <p>8 me respond to one of your questions in the</p> <p>9 30(b)(6) notice. And I have a board to the</p> <p>10 memo [sic] regarding NAV error, and I have the</p> <p>11 "Defendant's Second Motion for Leave to Amend</p> <p>12 Answer and Brief in Support Thereof" that was</p> <p>13 filed yesterday.</p> <p>14 So a number of documents that -- and I</p> <p>15 also have up on my screen your exhibits that I</p> <p>16 believe we'll be going through in one of the --</p> <p>17 let me check here -- Topic Number 5. So I have</p> <p>18 open, you know, a 650-page document that was filed</p> <p>19 in Docket 35 on May 24th, I believe, is the</p> <p>20 correct document. So those are the materials that</p> <p>21 I have.</p> <p>22 Q Excellent. I appreciate that.</p> <p>23 So you've seen -- you've seen at least</p> <p>24 the plaintiff's second amended notice of</p> <p>25 Rule 30(b)(6) deposition before today. Do I have</p>

<p>Page 10</p> <p>1 Dustin Norris</p> <p>2 that right?</p> <p>3 A That's correct.</p> <p>4 Q And you have that with you; right?</p> <p>5 A I do.</p> <p>6 Q Okay. Are you prepared to testify on</p> <p>7 behalf of HCMFA today on -- in connection with</p> <p>8 each of the topics in the deposition notice?</p> <p>9 A Yes, I am.</p> <p>10 Q All right.</p> <p>11 MR. MORRIS: Let's just, for the</p> <p>12 record, scroll down to make sure that the</p> <p>13 topics are the same as the -- the one that</p> <p>14 Mr. Norris has in front of him.</p> <p>15 BY MR. MORRIS:</p> <p>16 Q Do you see the first five topics on the</p> <p>17 screen?</p> <p>18 A I do.</p> <p>19 Q All right. Can you confirm that they're</p> <p>20 the same topics that you have in the second</p> <p>21 amended notice of deposition?</p> <p>22 A Yes. I'm looking now.</p> <p>23 Yes, they all are the same.</p> <p>24 Q Okay. And if we can continue to scroll</p> <p>25 down, you see Topics 6, 7, and 8 up on the screen,</p>	<p>Page 11</p> <p>1 Dustin Norris</p> <p>2 and 9. Are they the same as what you have?</p> <p>3 A Can you scroll down for 9?</p> <p>4 Q Uh-huh.</p> <p>5 A They look to be the same, yes.</p> <p>6 Q Okay. And let's just look at the last</p> <p>7 few. How about 10 through 14? Are they the same</p> <p>8 as the topics that are in your second amended</p> <p>9 notice?</p> <p>10 A They look to be the same, yes.</p> <p>11 Q Okay. And did you do anything to prepare</p> <p>12 for today's deposition?</p> <p>13 A I did.</p> <p>14 Q What did you do?</p> <p>15 A I reviewed all of the pleadings. I</p> <p>16 reviewed all of the -- the documents that were, I</p> <p>17 believe, responsive to -- to help me to respond to</p> <p>18 this, look through your exhibits. I had met with</p> <p>19 Mr. Rukavina as counsel. I met and spoke with</p> <p>20 Mr. Dondero. I spoke with Jason Post.</p> <p>21 I spoke with -- I reviewed my</p> <p>22 documents internally and emails, things that I</p> <p>23 might have had, confirmed with our IT group that</p> <p>24 they have provided all documents responsive to</p> <p>25 your discovery requests.</p>
<p>Page 12</p> <p>1 Dustin Norris</p> <p>2 I reviewed the depositions of</p> <p>3 Mr. Seery, of Frank Waterhouse, Dave Klos, and</p> <p>4 Kristin Hendrix. I met in person and by Zoom with</p> <p>5 Mr. Rukavina over the last few weeks, and -- so</p> <p>6 that -- that's the general -- you know, there may</p> <p>7 have been other things, but that's the general</p> <p>8 overview of the things that I did --</p> <p>9 Q I appreciate --</p> <p>10 A -- to understand the company's position.</p> <p>11 Q I appreciate that.</p> <p>12 So just focusing in on the people that</p> <p>13 you spoke with in connection with your</p> <p>14 preparation, one was Davor; right?</p> <p>15 A Correct.</p> <p>16 And I -- I may have -- I don't know if</p> <p>17 I said it or not, but DC Sauter as well I also</p> <p>18 spoke with.</p> <p>19 Q Okay. So the other people are DC Sauter,</p> <p>20 Jason Post, and Mr. Dondero. Do I have that</p> <p>21 right?</p> <p>22 A Correct.</p> <p>23 Q Did you speak with Frank Waterhouse at</p> <p>24 all?</p> <p>25 A No, I did not.</p>	<p>Page 13</p> <p>1 Dustin Norris</p> <p>2 Q Is there any particular reason you didn't</p> <p>3 speak with Mr. Waterhouse?</p> <p>4 A Yes.</p> <p>5 Q And what -- why didn't you speak with</p> <p>6 Mr. Waterhouse?</p> <p>7 A My -- my -- yeah, sorry.</p> <p>8 My understanding is his counsel did</p> <p>9 not allow us to speak with him regarding this,</p> <p>10 because HCMLP had sued him for various things, and</p> <p>11 so we weren't allowed to talk with him.</p> <p>12 You'll -- you'll note that DC, earlier</p> <p>13 on, had spoken to him. I believe that was back in</p> <p>14 April, if you look back and I'd refer you to</p> <p>15 Mr. Sauter's declaration. But in preparation for</p> <p>16 this, we did not speak with him. We needed to</p> <p>17 wait for his deposition based on his attorney's</p> <p>18 instructions.</p> <p>19 Q How many times did you speak with</p> <p>20 Mr. Dondero about today's deposition?</p> <p>21 A Multiple times over the last few weeks.</p> <p>22 Q And was Mr. Rukavina present for those</p> <p>23 discussions?</p> <p>24 A He was not.</p> <p>25 Q Can you tell me what you discussed with</p>

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 14</p> <p>1 Dustin Norris</p> <p>2 Mr. Dondero about today's deposition?</p> <p>3 A Yeah. Discussed with him general view of</p> <p>4 the company from his perspective. We discussed</p> <p>5 particularly around -- and we'll get into more</p> <p>6 details on this -- but around the purpose and</p> <p>7 transfer of cash, the seven-and-a-half million</p> <p>8 dollars. And I guess there were two transactions.</p> <p>9 Discussed with him what he remembered</p> <p>10 in discussions with Frank Waterhouse when he</p> <p>11 instructed him to transfer the cash, and any</p> <p>12 recollection he had regarding the notes or the --</p> <p>13 the -- the promissory notes.</p> <p>14 And so those were the general topics.</p> <p>15 And we did talk about --</p> <p>16 Q Did Mr. --</p> <p>17 A Sorry. Go ahead.</p> <p>18 Q Yeah, I don't mean to step on your words.</p> <p>19 A No, no.</p> <p>20 We talked about the NAV error, we</p> <p>21 talked about responsibility for the NAV error and</p> <p>22 those aspects as well.</p> <p>23 Q Did -- did Mr. Dondero tell you when he</p> <p>24 first learned of the existence of the notes?</p> <p>25 A No.</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 15</p> <p>1 Dustin Norris</p> <p>2 Q Did you ask him in connection with your</p> <p>3 preparation for today's deposition?</p> <p>4 A What I did ask, I asked him -- I said,</p> <p>5 "Did you tell Frank Waterhouse that there should</p> <p>6 be -- that this should be a loan?"</p> <p>7 And his response was, "No, that I</p> <p>8 never told Frank it should be a loan, and Frank</p> <p>9 never asked if it should be a loan." And that the</p> <p>10 intent -- and the reason for the transfer was</p> <p>11 compensation for the NAV error.</p> <p>12 And so that was -- he did not know --</p> <p>13 and if I -- if I remember correctly, looking at</p> <p>14 his deposition, I believe he did not know about</p> <p>15 the notes at that time and found out about them</p> <p>16 much later.</p> <p>17 Q I know, and I'm trying to understand from</p> <p>18 you if you can tell me, as HCMFA's 30(b)(6)</p> <p>19 representative, whether you can share with me when</p> <p>20 Mr. Dondero first learned of the existence of the</p> <p>21 notes.</p> <p>22 A It -- it would have been -- I believe, if</p> <p>23 my understanding is correct, it would have been</p> <p>24 after they were demanded.</p> <p>25 Q After they were?</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 16</p> <p>1 Dustin Norris</p> <p>2 A Demanded.</p> <p>3 Q Okay. How about your conversations with</p> <p>4 Mr. Post? Did the subject of when he learned</p> <p>5 about the existence of the notes come up?</p> <p>6 A No. That was not -- a discussion with</p> <p>7 Jason Post -- Post -- talking with Jason was more</p> <p>8 around the NAV error, the events surrounding the</p> <p>9 NAV error, facts and circumstances around the NAV</p> <p>10 error.</p> <p>11 Q Okay. And were your discussions with</p> <p>12 Mr. Sauter limited to the investigation that he</p> <p>13 undertook earlier this year that's reflected in</p> <p>14 his declaration?</p> <p>15 A I would say it's not limited to that.</p> <p>16 Q What other topics did you discuss with</p> <p>17 Mr. Sauter beyond the investigation that he</p> <p>18 undertook that's reflected in his declaration?</p> <p>19 MR. RUKAVINA: And I would just</p> <p>20 caution you, Dustin, that to the extent</p> <p>21 that you and Mr. Sauter discussed factual</p> <p>22 matters, that's fair game.</p> <p>23 But as far as if you discussed</p> <p>24 litigation strategy, that's not fair game.</p> <p>25 So be careful with your answer, please,</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 17</p> <p>1 Dustin Norris</p> <p>2 and tell Mr. Morris what you can and can't</p> <p>3 answer.</p> <p>4 THE WITNESS: Yeah.</p> <p>5 So early on with Mr. Sauter,</p> <p>6 discussions were around if I had any</p> <p>7 knowledge of the note, if he had any</p> <p>8 knowledge of the note, trying to discover</p> <p>9 what the notes were, what they were</p> <p>10 related to, and neither of us had</p> <p>11 knowledge related to notes.</p> <p>12 And then discussions around more</p> <p>13 generally -- I'm trying to think back.</p> <p>14 There were many discussions with</p> <p>15 Mr. Sauter on the topic.</p> <p>16 General facts and circumstances of</p> <p>17 what he was learning from his</p> <p>18 investigation in which -- all of which I</p> <p>19 would refer you to his declaration.</p> <p>20 And then subsequent, talking with</p> <p>21 him regarding the -- I'm trying to</p> <p>22 recollect the -- the key components.</p> <p>23 But it was general overview of --</p> <p>24 of the notes and NAV error and the</p> <p>25 process. He wasn't here during much of</p>

<p>Page 18</p> <p>1 Dustin Norris</p> <p>2 that time period or involved, and so we</p> <p>3 were talking together based on what he was</p> <p>4 doing.</p> <p>5 BY MR. MORRIS:</p> <p>6 Q Who are you employed by today?</p> <p>7 A NexPoint Advisors.</p> <p>8 Q Do you hold any position or title with</p> <p>9 HCMFA?</p> <p>10 A I do.</p> <p>11 Q And what's your position or title with</p> <p>12 HCMFA?</p> <p>13 A Executive vice president is my officer</p> <p>14 role.</p> <p>15 Q And when did you become an officer of</p> <p>16 HCMFA?</p> <p>17 A So I -- I was originally secretary -- and</p> <p>18 I can't remember if I was assistant secretary, but</p> <p>19 I've been involved with HCMFA since 2012. I don't</p> <p>20 know if I was added as an assistant secretary at</p> <p>21 that time; but for many -- for several years, I've</p> <p>22 been an officer of HCMFA.</p> <p>23 Q And you were an officer in 2018 and 2019;</p> <p>24 is that right?</p> <p>25 A Correct. I was secretary in 2018, and --</p>	<p>Page 19</p> <p>1 Dustin Norris</p> <p>2 I'm looking at the incumbency certificates here --</p> <p>3 and in 2019 in April became executive vice</p> <p>4 president. So from January to -- January 2018 to</p> <p>5 April 2019, I was secretary and then became</p> <p>6 executive vice president.</p> <p>7 Q When did you first learn of the existence</p> <p>8 of the notes?</p> <p>9 A So it was after they were demanded, and it</p> <p>10 was -- so I believe the demand came in in early</p> <p>11 2020 -- 2021. So January-ish 2021.</p> <p>12 Q Do you have any role or any title with any</p> <p>13 of the funds that are managed by either NexPoint</p> <p>14 or HCMFA?</p> <p>15 A I do.</p> <p>16 Q Can you describe those roles or titles for</p> <p>17 me, please?</p> <p>18 A Yeah. I'm -- I'm the executive vice</p> <p>19 president of the funds, and my role more broadly</p> <p>20 is I am the head of distribution and chief product</p> <p>21 strategist. And so in that role, I lead the sales</p> <p>22 and business development and marketing for the</p> <p>23 funds, more broadly.</p> <p>24 Q And what is your title with NexPoint</p> <p>25 Advisors, LP?</p>
<p>Page 20</p> <p>1 Dustin Norris</p> <p>2 A I am executive vice president in the</p> <p>3 officer capacity, and my role is -- as an employee</p> <p>4 is head of distribution and chief product</p> <p>5 strategist.</p> <p>6 Q Okay. So just to summarize, you're the</p> <p>7 executive vice president of NexPoint Advisors, LP;</p> <p>8 correct?</p> <p>9 A Correct.</p> <p>10 Q And that's an officer position; correct?</p> <p>11 A It is.</p> <p>12 Q And when did you attain that title?</p> <p>13 A Probably -- I don't have the incumbency</p> <p>14 certificates, but it was probably the same time as</p> <p>15 HCMFA.</p> <p>16 Q Is it fair to say that it was sometime</p> <p>17 before January 1st, 2018?</p> <p>18 A No.</p> <p>19 Q Can you give me an estimate of when that</p> <p>20 was? Feel free --</p> <p>21 A Yeah. The time-- the timeline for HCMFA</p> <p>22 was April 2019. I was secretary before that, and</p> <p>23 I don't recall if NexPoint Advisors changed at the</p> <p>24 same time.</p> <p>25 Q Okay. Can I refer to HCMFA and NexPoint</p>	<p>Page 21</p> <p>1 Dustin Norris</p> <p>2 Advisors, LP, together as "the advisers"?</p> <p>3 A That's fine.</p> <p>4 Q Okay. So is it fair to say that you were</p> <p>5 the executive vice president, which was an officer</p> <p>6 position, for each of the advisers as of April</p> <p>7 2019?</p> <p>8 A Yes.</p> <p>9 Q Okay. And --</p> <p>10 A I believe that's correct.</p> <p>11 Q And you also serve as the executive vice</p> <p>12 president of the funds that each of the advisers</p> <p>13 manages. Do I have that right?</p> <p>14 A Yes. Currently.</p> <p>15 Q And have you held the --</p> <p>16 A Yes, currently.</p> <p>17 Q And when did you become the executive vice</p> <p>18 president of the funds?</p> <p>19 A I don't remember the exact date, if that</p> <p>20 was around the same time, but I was the secretary</p> <p>21 before that and assistant secretary before that,</p> <p>22 dating back to 2012.</p> <p>23 Q So you've been -- is it fair to say that</p> <p>24 you've been an officer of the funds managed by the</p> <p>25 advisers since at least 2013?</p>

<p>Page 22</p> <p>1 Dustin Norris</p> <p>2 A I believe so. I'd have to go back and</p> <p>3 look for sure, but I believe. There may have been</p> <p>4 periods of time where I was not, but yes.</p> <p>5 Q Okay. Were any of those periods of time</p> <p>6 when you were not, at any point since 2018 to the</p> <p>7 present?</p> <p>8 A I don't believe so.</p> <p>9 Q Okay. So to the best of your</p> <p>10 recollection, you've served as an executive vice</p> <p>11 president of each of the funds managed by the</p> <p>12 advisers since at least the beginning of 2018; is</p> <p>13 that fair?</p> <p>14 A No. That's -- that's different than my</p> <p>15 prior testimony that -- I was secretary until</p> <p>16 April --</p> <p>17 Q I apologize. Let me restate the question.</p> <p>18 You've been an officer of -- of the</p> <p>19 funds managed by the advisers on a continuous</p> <p>20 basis since at least the beginning of 2018; fair?</p> <p>21 A I believe that's correct, yes.</p> <p>22 Q Thank you for the question -- for -- for</p> <p>23 the correction.</p> <p>24 So as I think you pointed out earlier,</p> <p>25 one of the topics on the 30(b)(6) notice is the</p>	<p>Page 23</p> <p>1 Dustin Norris</p> <p>2 identity of officers, directors, and employees of</p> <p>3 HCMFA?</p> <p>4 A Uh-huh.</p> <p>5 Q Do you want to take a look at that topic</p> <p>6 on the document that you have in front of you?</p> <p>7 A Yes.</p> <p>8 Q Okay.</p> <p>9 A That is -- which topic?</p> <p>10 Q 13.</p> <p>11 A 13, yes.</p> <p>12 Q Okay. So let's focus on 13 for a moment.</p> <p>13 Can you -- can you identify for me</p> <p>14 HCMFA's officers from January 1st, 2018, to the</p> <p>15 present --</p> <p>16 A Yes.</p> <p>17 Q -- including names and titles?</p> <p>18 A Yes.</p> <p>19 Q Okay.</p> <p>20 A So from January 1st, 2018 -- and I don't</p> <p>21 have -- I -- I'm assuming that the dates that I</p> <p>22 have on the incumbency certificates are complete,</p> <p>23 but I'm not certain, and -- if there was one in</p> <p>24 between, but I'm assuming this is -- that the</p> <p>25 dates I have changing is -- is effective when they</p>
<p>Page 24</p> <p>1 Dustin Norris</p> <p>2 changed.</p> <p>3 But Brad Ross was president of HCMFA</p> <p>4 from January 1st, 2018, until, I believe,</p> <p>5 February 2018 -- sorry -- yeah, until</p> <p>6 February 2018.</p> <p>7 In that same time period, Brad Ross,</p> <p>8 president; Trey Parker, executive vice president;</p> <p>9 Frank Waterhouse, treasurer; Dustin Norris,</p> <p>10 secretary.</p> <p>11 And effective 26th of February --</p> <p>12 Q I apologize. What is Mr. Parker's title?</p> <p>13 A Executive vice president.</p> <p>14 Q Thank you.</p> <p>15 A And beginning February 26th, 2018, Trey</p> <p>16 Parker, executive vice president; Frank</p> <p>17 Waterhouse, treasurer; and Dustin Norris,</p> <p>18 secretary; and no longer president, Brad Ross.</p> <p>19 There's no president on the lineup.</p> <p>20 So continuing on, April 11th, 2019,</p> <p>21 Dustin Norris, executive vice president; Frank</p> <p>22 Waterhouse, treasurer; Lauren Thedford, secretary.</p> <p>23 Q And Trey Parker was no longer an officer</p> <p>24 as of that time?</p> <p>25 A He was no longer an officer.</p>	<p>Page 25</p> <p>1 Dustin Norris</p> <p>2 Q Okay.</p> <p>3 A And February 18th, 2021, Dustin Norris,</p> <p>4 executive vice president; Frank Waterhouse,</p> <p>5 treasurer; Brian Mitts, assistant treasurer; David</p> <p>6 Willmore, secretary. So Lauren Thedford, no</p> <p>7 longer secretary.</p> <p>8 Q And have there been any changes since</p> <p>9 February 2021?</p> <p>10 A Yes. You have April 8, 2021, Dustin</p> <p>11 Norris, executive president; Frank Waterhouse,</p> <p>12 treasurer; Will Mabry, assistant treasurer; and</p> <p>13 Stephanie Vitiello, secretary.</p> <p>14 Again, I -- I don't have -- this is</p> <p>15 based on what was provided to me with effective</p> <p>16 dates. I don't know if there was any that were</p> <p>17 missing, if that's complete, but I -- I believe</p> <p>18 those are accurate.</p> <p>19 Q Is it fair to say that you're relying on</p> <p>20 exclusively on the incumbency certificates to</p> <p>21 identify the officers of HCMFA since January 1st,</p> <p>22 2018?</p> <p>23 A For this purpose, yes.</p> <p>24 Q Do you have any other information that you</p> <p>25 can share with me regarding the identity of any</p>

<p>Page 26</p> <p>1 Dustin Norris</p> <p>2 officers of HCMFA since January 1st, 2018?</p> <p>3 A I don't, no.</p> <p>4 Q Okay. Can you identify for me HCMFA's</p> <p>5 direct and indirect owners since January 1st,</p> <p>6 2018?</p> <p>7 A I can, yes. Generally Jim Dondero and</p> <p>8 Mark Okada are the indirect owners through trusts.</p> <p>9 They own approximately two-thirds, Jim Dondero, a</p> <p>10 little less than a third, Mark Okada, with a</p> <p>11 general partner that is -- that owns 1 percent.</p> <p>12 Q And who is the general partner?</p> <p>13 A It's a Strand entity that I believe is</p> <p>14 owned 100 percent by Mr. Dondero.</p> <p>15 Q So Mr. Dondero controls the general</p> <p>16 partner --</p> <p>17 A Right.</p> <p>18 Q -- of HCMFA?</p> <p>19 A Correct, and owns approximately two-thirds</p> <p>20 of the equity.</p> <p>21 Q And is that a controlling interest to the</p> <p>22 best of your knowledge?</p> <p>23 A Yes, I believe so.</p> <p>24 Q Okay. Does HCMFA have any directors?</p> <p>25 A It does not. It has a sole director</p>	<p>Page 27</p> <p>1 Dustin Norris</p> <p>2 through the general partners. So HCMFA does</p> <p>3 not -- Strand -- whatever the Strand entity does,</p> <p>4 Jim Dondero is the sole director.</p> <p>5 Q Okay. And what about employees? Does</p> <p>6 HCMFA have any employees?</p> <p>7 A It does have some front-office employees,</p> <p>8 trading professionals.</p> <p>9 Q Are there any employees who perform any</p> <p>10 services other than trading services?</p> <p>11 A Trading in front-office investment</p> <p>12 analysts, portfolio managers, generally that's</p> <p>13 been the structure with HCMFA, is they held --</p> <p>14 they had employees that performed front-office</p> <p>15 functions, and we, as I believe you're aware,</p> <p>16 outsourced the back-office accounting, compliance,</p> <p>17 and legal services to Highland Capital Management,</p> <p>18 LP, during this time period.</p> <p>19 Q Let's go to Topic Number 12.</p> <p>20 A Okay.</p> <p>21 Q And Topic Number 12 asks for a witness who</p> <p>22 can testify as to all communications that HCMFA</p> <p>23 "made in the bankruptcy case concerning the notes,</p> <p>24 including any pleadings, court filing, or</p> <p>25 argument."</p>
<p>Page 28</p> <p>1 Dustin Norris</p> <p>2 Do you see that?</p> <p>3 A I do.</p> <p>4 Q Are you prepared to answer questions on</p> <p>5 that topic?</p> <p>6 A I am.</p> <p>7 Q All right. You're aware that obviously</p> <p>8 Highland has commenced an adversary proceeding</p> <p>9 against HCMFA to collect on two promissory notes;</p> <p>10 right?</p> <p>11 A I am, yes, and I believe this right here</p> <p>12 is the complaint filed January 22nd.</p> <p>13 Q Okay. And you're aware that the notes</p> <p>14 that are the subject of the lawsuit were dated</p> <p>15 May 2nd and May 3rd, 2019, respectively; right?</p> <p>16 A Sorry. Can you repeat that?</p> <p>17 Q You're aware that the notes that are the</p> <p>18 subject of the lawsuit are dated May 2nd and</p> <p>19 May 3rd, 2019, respectively; correct?</p> <p>20 A Yes. The notes that are attached to the</p> <p>21 complaint, May 2nd and May 3rd.</p> <p>22 Q Okay. And can we refer to those two</p> <p>23 notes -- those two promissory notes for the rest</p> <p>24 of this deposition collectively as "the notes"?</p> <p>25 A Yes.</p>	<p>Page 29</p> <p>1 Dustin Norris</p> <p>2 Q Okay. And you're aware that after</p> <p>3 Highland commenced this action, HCMFA filed its</p> <p>4 original answer; correct?</p> <p>5 A That's correct.</p> <p>6 Q Okay. And Topic Number 1 on your list, in</p> <p>7 fact, is the answer, correct, the original answer?</p> <p>8 A That's correct. It's Topic Number 1.</p> <p>9 MR. MORRIS: Okay. Can we put</p> <p>10 Deposition Exhibit 5 up on the screen?</p> <p>11 We're going to look at the original</p> <p>12 answer.</p> <p>13 (Exhibit 5 tendered.)</p> <p>14 BY MR. MORRIS:</p> <p>15 Q And, again, feel free to let me know if</p> <p>16 there's any portion of this document that you need</p> <p>17 to see. But looking at the first page -- and</p> <p>18 perhaps we can continue to scroll through it -- is</p> <p>19 this the original answer that was filed on behalf</p> <p>20 of HCMFA on March 1st, 2021?</p> <p>21 A I'll take your representation that it is.</p> <p>22 It looks to be, yeah.</p> <p>23 Q Okay.</p> <p>24 A I was not involved in the filing of it,</p> <p>25 but...</p>

<p>Page 30</p> <p>1 Dustin Norris</p> <p>2 Q Okay. Is the copy that you have with you</p> <p>3 dated March 1st, 2021?</p> <p>4 A Yes, it is.</p> <p>5 Q And if you can turn to Page 6 of 7, does</p> <p>6 it appear to be the exact same as what appears on</p> <p>7 the screen, showing the March 1st, 2021, date?</p> <p>8 A It does.</p> <p>9 Q And do you refer to the March 1st, 2021,</p> <p>10 date, as "the answer date"?</p> <p>11 A Yes.</p> <p>12 Q Okay. HCMFA did not assert any</p> <p>13 affirmative defenses in this pleading; correct?</p> <p>14 A That's my understanding.</p> <p>15 Q Okay. And HCMFA had full access to you as</p> <p>16 of March 1st, 2021; correct?</p> <p>17 A Yes.</p> <p>18 Q And HCMFA had full access to Mr. Dondero</p> <p>19 as of March 1st, 2021; correct?</p> <p>20 A In the term "full access," they could have</p> <p>21 talked to him, yes.</p> <p>22 Q Right. And there was no restriction from</p> <p>23 the bankruptcy court or otherwise on HCMFA's</p> <p>24 ability to communicate with Mr. Dondero that you</p> <p>25 know of; correct?</p>	<p>Page 31</p> <p>1 Dustin Norris</p> <p>2 A None that I know of.</p> <p>3 Q And there was no restriction or limitation</p> <p>4 on HCMFA's ability to speak with you at or prior</p> <p>5 to March 1st, 2021; correct?</p> <p>6 A That's correct.</p> <p>7 Q How about Ms. Thedford? Are you aware of</p> <p>8 any restriction or limitation on HCMFA's ability</p> <p>9 to speak with her prior to March 1st, 2021?</p> <p>10 A Yes.</p> <p>11 Q Okay. And what restriction was that?</p> <p>12 A Yeah. So she was part of the Highland</p> <p>13 legal team. She was an employee of HCMLP. And</p> <p>14 during this time period, we had outsourced our</p> <p>15 legal and compliance functions to them. And if --</p> <p>16 I would refer you to Mr. Sauter's declaration and</p> <p>17 the attachments and schedules. There's a very</p> <p>18 strict direction from Mr. Seery that</p> <p>19 individuals -- particularly on the legal team --</p> <p>20 could not work on anything that would be inimical</p> <p>21 to the debtor.</p> <p>22 Q Okay.</p> <p>23 A And so Ms. Thedford, on multiple</p> <p>24 occasions, told us she was unable to work on</p> <p>25 things, and that began back in fall of 2000 --</p>
<p>Page 32</p> <p>1 Dustin Norris</p> <p>2 fall of 2020 -- late summer 2020, actually. And</p> <p>3 so she was not accessible for things like this.</p> <p>4 Q How about Mr. Post? Do you know who</p> <p>5 Mr. Post was employed by in 2018 and 2019?</p> <p>6 A 2018 and '19, he was employed by Highland</p> <p>7 Capital Management, LP.</p> <p>8 Q Do you know whether, in your conversations</p> <p>9 with him, does he have any personal knowledge</p> <p>10 regarding the NAV error?</p> <p>11 A Yes.</p> <p>12 Q Was he involved in any of the issues</p> <p>13 surrounding the NAV error?</p> <p>14 A He was knowledgeable -- as he was</p> <p>15 chief -- chief compliance officer of the retail</p> <p>16 advisers at that time, and interacted with the</p> <p>17 HCMLP employees and the board regarding the NAV</p> <p>18 error, he also -- in your schedules, you'll notice</p> <p>19 in one of the memos, he participated in calls with</p> <p>20 the SEC, and so he was -- he was involved in the</p> <p>21 process of the NAV error and understood and worked</p> <p>22 with the other HCMLP employees, which naturally</p> <p>23 they would. We had outsourced valuation services</p> <p>24 to HCMLP. We had outsourced legal and compliance</p> <p>25 to HCMLP, and as such, that was all part of what</p>	<p>Page 33</p> <p>1 Dustin Norris</p> <p>2 they were working on.</p> <p>3 Q Did -- did -- were there any restrictions</p> <p>4 or limitations on HCMFA's ability to speak with</p> <p>5 Mr. Post prior to March 1st, 2021?</p> <p>6 A So once -- so Jason -- one important</p> <p>7 component here is Jason Post did leave the debtor,</p> <p>8 and working with Mr. Seery, I believe, to then</p> <p>9 leave and become an employee of NexPoint Advisors,</p> <p>10 and that was at the request of our retail board,</p> <p>11 as there were restrictions on Mr. Post at that</p> <p>12 time.</p> <p>13 And as chief compliance officer of the</p> <p>14 funds, the board had become very uncomfortable</p> <p>15 that they had restrictions on Mr. Post. And so it</p> <p>16 was in everybody's interest to allow him to become</p> <p>17 an employee of NexPoint Advisors, and so that was</p> <p>18 late 2020, I believe. I don't know the exact</p> <p>19 date. And at that time, there were certain things</p> <p>20 that Jason was able to then help the adviser with,</p> <p>21 but there were still restrictions. And he had</p> <p>22 limited access to his prior data. He left the</p> <p>23 debtor, but he didn't have -- I believe he had</p> <p>24 restrictions on what he could access in the</p> <p>25 information.</p>

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 34</p> <p>1 Dustin Norris</p> <p>2 Q Okay. But it is fair to say that between</p> <p>3 January 21st, 2021, the day that the complaint was</p> <p>4 filed, and March 1st, 2021, the date that HCMFA</p> <p>5 filed its original answer, HCMFA had complete and</p> <p>6 unfettered access to you, to Mr. Dondero, and</p> <p>7 Mr. Post; correct?</p> <p>8 A Again, the complete and unfettered access</p> <p>9 on the Jason Post aspect, they could have talked</p> <p>10 to him. I'm not sure if there were any other</p> <p>11 restrictions related to what he had or information</p> <p>12 he had or based on his prior role of the debtor,</p> <p>13 he was restricted on what he could or couldn't</p> <p>14 talk about, if he had any lease agreement. I'm</p> <p>15 not certain on that. But, yes, we could talk</p> <p>16 to -- or HCMFA could talk to Mr. Post.</p> <p>17 Q Okay. And the topics that you just raised</p> <p>18 are speculation on your part; correct?</p> <p>19 A It is.</p> <p>20 Q You're not aware of any restriction of --</p> <p>21 you don't have any knowledge of any restriction or</p> <p>22 limitation placed on HCMFA in respect of its</p> <p>23 ability to communicate with Mr. Post between</p> <p>24 January 21st, 2021, and March 1st, 2021; correct?</p> <p>25 A Based on my personal knowledge, no. There</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 35</p> <p>1 Dustin Norris</p> <p>2 could have been something, but --</p> <p>3 Q Okay. I'm just asking about your</p> <p>4 knowledge, not what could have been.</p> <p>5 All right. So we're going to use</p> <p>6 March 1st, 2021, as the answer date.</p> <p>7 Are you aware of any document that</p> <p>8 HCMFA filed with the bankruptcy court prior to the</p> <p>9 answer date that concerns or relates in any way to</p> <p>10 the notes?</p> <p>11 A I'm thinking if I'm aware.</p> <p>12 Not that I'm aware of.</p> <p>13 Q Are you aware -- withdrawn.</p> <p>14 Do you know what a "pleading" is, if I</p> <p>15 use that phrase?</p> <p>16 A I believe so. These are the answers that</p> <p>17 we gave. The first answer, the amended answer,</p> <p>18 and the second amended answer, that -- I believe</p> <p>19 those are the two pleadings. Is that correct?</p> <p>20 Q You know what? I think my first question</p> <p>21 was broad enough, because I just used the word</p> <p>22 "document," so I'm going to let that sit.</p> <p>23 Are you aware of any argument that</p> <p>24 anybody ever made on behalf of HCMFA prior to the</p> <p>25 answer date that concerned or related to any of</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 36</p> <p>1 Dustin Norris</p> <p>2 the notes?</p> <p>3 A And you mean an argument to the Court?</p> <p>4 Q Yes.</p> <p>5 A Not that I'm aware of.</p> <p>6 Q Okay. Are you aware of any statement of</p> <p>7 any kind that was made to the bankruptcy court</p> <p>8 prior to the answer date that concerned or related</p> <p>9 in any way to the notes?</p> <p>10 A Not that I can remember. But there's</p> <p>11 obviously been a lot of documents with the Court,</p> <p>12 but not that I'm aware of.</p> <p>13 Q Right. But you -- did you do anything to</p> <p>14 prepare yourself to answer questions on Topic 12?</p> <p>15 A Yes.</p> <p>16 Q And do you believe that you're able to</p> <p>17 competently answer my questions relating to</p> <p>18 Topic 12 as HCMFA's 30(b)(6) witness?</p> <p>19 A I am. But I guess in this regard you're</p> <p>20 asking to my knowledge. And so, I guess, that --</p> <p>21 are you asking my personal knowledge or as my</p> <p>22 knowledge as a representative of the company?</p> <p>23 Q All right. I appreciate that.</p> <p>24 I am only examining you today in your</p> <p>25 capacity as a 30(b)(6) witness.</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 37</p> <p>1 Dustin Norris</p> <p>2 A Okay. That makes sense. Okay.</p> <p>3 Q And so if I use the phrase "you," just as</p> <p>4 we did in the deposition notice, I'm really</p> <p>5 referring to HCMFA; is that fair?</p> <p>6 A That's fair.</p> <p>7 Q Okay. So let me just ask the questions</p> <p>8 again with that clarification.</p> <p>9 Are you aware, in your capacity as the</p> <p>10 30(b)(6) witness today, of any document that was</p> <p>11 ever filed on behalf of HCMFA prior to the answer</p> <p>12 date that concerns or relates to the notes?</p> <p>13 A No.</p> <p>14 Q Are you aware, in your capacity as the</p> <p>15 HCMFA 30(b)(6) witness, of any argument that was</p> <p>16 ever made to the Court prior to the answer date</p> <p>17 that concerns or relates in any way to the notes?</p> <p>18 A No.</p> <p>19 Q Are you aware of -- again, when I use the</p> <p>20 phrase "you," I'm referring to HCMFA, just to</p> <p>21 shorten these questions a little bit.</p> <p>22 Are you aware of any statement that</p> <p>23 was ever made on your behalf to the bankruptcy</p> <p>24 court prior to the answer date that concerns or</p> <p>25 relates in any way to the notes?</p>

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 38</p> <p>1 Dustin Norris</p> <p>2 A Not that I recall.</p> <p>3 Q Okay. When did HCMFA first learn of the</p> <p>4 existence of the notes?</p> <p>5 A So HCMFA's position is that they learned</p> <p>6 of them when they were demanded, or after they</p> <p>7 were demanded. I don't even know that when we</p> <p>8 received -- or who they were sent to, but it was</p> <p>9 after they were demanded.</p> <p>10 Q Okay. And do you recall when they were</p> <p>11 demanded?</p> <p>12 A I don't have the exact date. If you could</p> <p>13 remind me or show a document, that might be</p> <p>14 helpful. I don't know if you have the demand, or</p> <p>15 if that's one of the documents, but I don't</p> <p>16 remember the specific date.</p> <p>17 MR. MORRIS: Can we put Exhibit 1</p> <p>18 up on the screen?</p> <p>19 It's actually the complaint -- the</p> <p>20 original complaint, sir.</p> <p>21 (Exhibit 1 tendered.)</p> <p>22 BY MR. MORRIS:</p> <p>23 Q If you go to Exhibit 3, do you see there's</p> <p>24 a demand letter there?</p> <p>25 A Yes.</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 39</p> <p>1 Dustin Norris</p> <p>2 Q And you've seen that before; right?</p> <p>3 A I have.</p> <p>4 Q Okay. And are you -- do you see that it</p> <p>5 was sent to Mr. Waterhouse?</p> <p>6 A Yes.</p> <p>7 Q And Mr. Waterhouse was the treasurer of</p> <p>8 HCMFA on December 3rd, 2020; correct?</p> <p>9 A Correct.</p> <p>10 Q Okay. So is it fair to say that HCMFA</p> <p>11 knew of the existence of the notes on</p> <p>12 December 3rd, 2020?</p> <p>13 A It's safe to say that Frank Waterhouse</p> <p>14 received this. I'm not sure the date exactly</p> <p>15 when -- when the company became aware. Frank,</p> <p>16 yes, is an officer. He's also -- the irony here,</p> <p>17 he's CFO of the debtor who is demanding this, so</p> <p>18 he's demanding it from himself. I know it's</p> <p>19 coming from -- from who is sending it, but at this</p> <p>20 time, I don't know when Mr. Dondero or other</p> <p>21 officers became aware of it. Sometime after</p> <p>22 December 3rd.</p> <p>23 Q Okay. Do you know if HCMFA ever responded</p> <p>24 to this demand letter prior to the time the</p> <p>25 complaint was filed on January 21st, 2021?</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 40</p> <p>1 Dustin Norris</p> <p>2 A I don't believe they did.</p> <p>3 Q So it's fair to say that nobody on behalf</p> <p>4 of HCMFA ever told any representative of Highland</p> <p>5 that it was previously unaware of the existence of</p> <p>6 the notes?</p> <p>7 A Sorry. Can you repeat that one more time?</p> <p>8 Q HCMFA never responded to this letter prior</p> <p>9 to the commencement of the lawsuit; right?</p> <p>10 A Not to my knowledge, didn't respond to</p> <p>11 HCMLP on this.</p> <p>12 Q Is there a reason why they didn't reach</p> <p>13 out to Highland to let Highland know that it</p> <p>14 disputed the existence of these notes?</p> <p>15 A I don't know if there's a reason, but I do</p> <p>16 know, during this time period, you'll recall,</p> <p>17 December and January, leading up to the actual</p> <p>18 demand -- or the initial complaint, there was a</p> <p>19 lot going on. We were almost in daily depositions</p> <p>20 and court hearings. There was a hearing</p> <p>21 injunction handed out against Jim. There was a</p> <p>22 restraining order. There -- TRO. There were</p> <p>23 lawsuits against the advisers. And so there was a</p> <p>24 lot going on, and I think this was put back in the</p> <p>25 priority line.</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 41</p> <p>1 Dustin Norris</p> <p>2 Again, all of the compliance and legal</p> <p>3 functions at this time, December 2020, were being</p> <p>4 outsourced to HCMLP, and we were told they were</p> <p>5 unable to help with anything that was inimical to</p> <p>6 the debtor. And so there were no employees of</p> <p>7 HCMFA that were legal compliance professionals,</p> <p>8 and so this -- this was -- I guess -- this is my</p> <p>9 speculation -- was put in the back of the line, or</p> <p>10 further back from the actual litigation that they</p> <p>11 were defending or working against the daily</p> <p>12 depositions and coordinating.</p> <p>13 Q Do you have any reason to believe, as you</p> <p>14 sit here right now, that Mr. Waterhouse did not</p> <p>15 receive this demand letter on or about</p> <p>16 December 3rd, 2020?</p> <p>17 A I don't know. I don't have any reason to</p> <p>18 believe that, but I don't know.</p> <p>19 Q Okay.</p> <p>20 A And I don't recall what he testified to in</p> <p>21 regard to receiving the demand, but we see here it</p> <p>22 was sent to him. We can assume it got sent to</p> <p>23 him.</p> <p>24 Q Okay. Let me ask the question again, and</p> <p>25 I would appreciate you listening carefully to my</p>

<p>Page 42</p> <p>1 Dustin Norris</p> <p>2 question.</p> <p>3 As HCMFA's 30(b)(6) witness today,</p> <p>4 does HCMFA contend that this letter was not</p> <p>5 received by Mr. Waterhouse on or about</p> <p>6 December 3rd, 2020?</p> <p>7 MR. RUKAVINA: Well, that's not our</p> <p>8 contention. We agree that it was received</p> <p>9 on or about that date.</p> <p>10 MR. MORRIS: Okay.</p> <p>11 THE WITNESS: Yeah. That's --</p> <p>12 yeah.</p> <p>13 BY MR. MORRIS:</p> <p>14 Q Okay. HCMFA actually knew about the notes</p> <p>15 just weeks after they were signed; correct?</p> <p>16 MR. RUKAVINA: Objection; form.</p> <p>17 THE WITNESS: So the debtor</p> <p>18 employees who created the notes knew about</p> <p>19 them, but it was not knowledge of HCMFA.</p> <p>20 Those were all Highland Capital</p> <p>21 Management, LP, employees.</p> <p>22 BY MR. MORRIS:</p> <p>23 Q So it's your testimony that HCMFA had no</p> <p>24 knowledge of the existence of the notes in</p> <p>25 June 2019; is that correct?</p>	<p>Page 43</p> <p>1 Dustin Norris</p> <p>2 A June 2019.</p> <p>3 Correct.</p> <p>4 Q As the executive vice president of HCMFA,</p> <p>5 have you ever reviewed HCMFA's audited financial</p> <p>6 statements?</p> <p>7 A I have not.</p> <p>8 Q Is there anybody on behalf of HCMFA who is</p> <p>9 charged with the responsibility of reading HCMFA's</p> <p>10 audited financial statements?</p> <p>11 A Yeah. We -- again, the key here is we</p> <p>12 outsourced finance, accounting, back-office</p> <p>13 functions. It includes financial statement</p> <p>14 preparation. The treasurer of HCMFA is an HCMLP</p> <p>15 employee, Frank Waterhouse, at that time, and at</p> <p>16 all times that we're talking about. And so with</p> <p>17 we -- and Frank is a professional, and his team</p> <p>18 are professionals, right? We outsource to an</p> <p>19 accounting group to prepare and oversee, work with</p> <p>20 the auditors in preparation of those financials.</p> <p>21 And so they were tasked with that. And we relied</p> <p>22 on them. And there was not a specialist during</p> <p>23 this time period that did that.</p> <p>24 Q Does Frank Waterhouse have any</p> <p>25 responsibility, as the treasurer of HCMFA, to make</p>
<p>Page 44</p> <p>1 Dustin Norris</p> <p>2 sure that HCMFA's audited financial statements are</p> <p>3 true, accurate, and reliable?</p> <p>4 A Him and his team, yeah. We actually --</p> <p>5 that's what we rely on them for.</p> <p>6 Q And did you rely on him not only in his</p> <p>7 capacity as an employee of Highland, but in his</p> <p>8 capacity as the treasurer of HCMFA?</p> <p>9 A Yeah, he was -- let's take the first --</p> <p>10 as a -- in his capacity under the shared services</p> <p>11 agreement, okay, doing accounting, books and</p> <p>12 records, audited -- audit support, yes, we relied</p> <p>13 on him in that capacity. And he also, as an HCMLP</p> <p>14 employee, served as a treasurer of HCMFA. In that</p> <p>15 role, we would expect him to oversee the</p> <p>16 financials.</p> <p>17 MR. MORRIS: Okay. And move to</p> <p>18 strike.</p> <p>19 BY MR. MORRIS:</p> <p>20 Q And I'm going to ask you very</p> <p>21 specifically: As HCMFA's representative today,</p> <p>22 did Frank Waterhouse have a duty as the treasurer</p> <p>23 of HCMFA to make sure that HCMFA's audited</p> <p>24 financial statements were true and accurate?</p> <p>25 A That -- very specific from the treasurer</p>	<p>Page 45</p> <p>1 Dustin Norris</p> <p>2 role, I would say the treasurer role was to</p> <p>3 oversee the financial aspects of the advisers.</p> <p>4 Q And was one of those aspects HCMFA's</p> <p>5 audited financial statements?</p> <p>6 A As -- yeah. And he was -- again, I'll</p> <p>7 reiterate, he was the CFO of Highland who was</p> <p>8 tasked with creating the financial statements for</p> <p>9 the advisers.</p> <p>10 MR. MORRIS: Okay. I'm again going</p> <p>11 to move to strike.</p> <p>12 BY MR. MORRIS:</p> <p>13 Q I'm not asking about his role as CFO of</p> <p>14 Highland. I'm limiting it strictly to his role as</p> <p>15 the treasurer of HCMFA.</p> <p>16 A And I don't have --</p> <p>17 Q Did Frank -- let me ask my question.</p> <p>18 Is any officer of HCMFA responsible</p> <p>19 for making sure that HCMFA's audited financial</p> <p>20 statements are true and accurate?</p> <p>21 A I don't know, but I would assume -- and I</p> <p>22 don't want to make assumptions here as the</p> <p>23 representative -- but I would assume that the</p> <p>24 treasurer would have that role.</p> <p>25 Q Okay. And what is your assumption based</p>

<p>Page 46</p> <p>1 Dustin Norris</p> <p>2 on?</p> <p>3 A Based on the understanding of what a</p> <p>4 treasurer role would be. But I -- I don't have</p> <p>5 any -- I don't have any knowledge, I'm not</p> <p>6 representing that we have any roles and</p> <p>7 responsibilities or defined procedures that the</p> <p>8 treasurer does this, that, or the other.</p> <p>9 Q Okay. Have you -- as you sit here right</p> <p>10 now, have you ever seen HCMFA's audited financial</p> <p>11 statements for the period ending December 31st,</p> <p>12 2018?</p> <p>13 A I saw them in the materials that were</p> <p>14 provided in your schedules, I believe.</p> <p>15 Q Okay. Let's --</p> <p>16 A That was the first time.</p> <p>17 Q Let's take a quick look at it.</p> <p>18 MR. MORRIS: If we could put up on</p> <p>19 the screen the document that's been marked</p> <p>20 Exhibit 45.</p> <p>21 (Exhibit 45 tendered.)</p> <p>22 BY MR. MORRIS:</p> <p>23 Q Okay. And do you see that this is the</p> <p>24 first page of HCMFA's audited financial statements</p> <p>25 for the period ending December 31st, 2018?</p>	<p>Page 47</p> <p>1 Dustin Norris</p> <p>2 A I do.</p> <p>3 MR. MORRIS: Okay. And if we could</p> <p>4 just scroll, I think, to the third page.</p> <p>5 BY MR. MORRIS:</p> <p>6 Q Do you see that it's signed by</p> <p>7 PricewaterhouseCoopers on June 3rd, 2019?</p> <p>8 A I see that the audit opinion is signed by</p> <p>9 them, yes.</p> <p>10 Q Correct. And -- and you're aware that</p> <p>11 PricewaterhouseCoopers was the outside auditor</p> <p>12 retained by HCMFA to conduct the audit of HCMFA's</p> <p>13 financial statements; correct?</p> <p>14 A Given that they gave an opinion, yes.</p> <p>15 Q Okay. And you have no reason to believe</p> <p>16 that the document that's up on the screen is</p> <p>17 anything other than HCMFA's audited financial</p> <p>18 statements for the period ending December 31st,</p> <p>19 2018, do you?</p> <p>20 And we're happy -- I'm happy to scroll</p> <p>21 through whatever you need to see.</p> <p>22 A Yeah. And there they're distinguishing --</p> <p>23 you have an audit opinion and having audited</p> <p>24 financials, I assume that you have all that is</p> <p>25 here. You showed me the first page of the</p>
<p>Page 48</p> <p>1 Dustin Norris</p> <p>2 financials, which --</p> <p>3 Q Yeah. Yeah. Let's --</p> <p>4 A So I'm assuming that's the --</p> <p>5 Q Let's scroll down just a little bit.</p> <p>6 You can see that the next page is</p> <p>7 HCMFA's balance sheet. Do you see that?</p> <p>8 A I do.</p> <p>9 Q Okay.</p> <p>10 MR. MORRIS: Can we go to</p> <p>11 "Subsequent Events"? I think it's</p> <p>12 Page 17.</p> <p>13 BY MR. MORRIS:</p> <p>14 Q Have you seen this page of HCMFA's audited</p> <p>15 financial statements before?</p> <p>16 A Just in preparation for this.</p> <p>17 Q Do you understand that in the "Subsequent</p> <p>18 Events" section, the notes are described in the</p> <p>19 audited financial statements?</p> <p>20 A There is a reference to promissory notes</p> <p>21 in aggregate of \$7.4 million, yes.</p> <p>22 Q And those are the two notes that Highland</p> <p>23 is suing on; correct?</p> <p>24 A I would assume that's the case, because</p> <p>25 the dollar amounts line up. But I don't have the</p>	<p>Page 49</p> <p>1 Dustin Norris</p> <p>2 backup, but I would assume that's the case.</p> <p>3 Q And not only do the dollar amounts line</p> <p>4 up, but do you see that the statement in</p> <p>5 "Subsequent Events" specifically identifies the</p> <p>6 notes as having been issued in the year 2019?</p> <p>7 A Yes.</p> <p>8 Q And are you aware of any notes that</p> <p>9 anybody in the world contends were signed by HCMFA</p> <p>10 between January 1st, 2019, and June 3rd, 2019,</p> <p>11 other than the two notes that Highland is suing</p> <p>12 on?</p> <p>13 A No.</p> <p>14 Q Okay. So can you conclude, as HCMFA's</p> <p>15 30(b)(6) witness, that the notes that are</p> <p>16 described in the subsequent events are the very</p> <p>17 notes that are the subject of the pending lawsuit?</p> <p>18 A That appears to be the case.</p> <p>19 Q Okay. And so it's also fair to say, then,</p> <p>20 that HCMFA does not dispute that its own audited</p> <p>21 financial statements that were the subject of a</p> <p>22 June 3rd, 2019, opinion by PricewaterhouseCoopers</p> <p>23 disclosed the existence of the notes at issue;</p> <p>24 correct?</p> <p>25 A No. We don't dispute that that was</p>

<p>Page 50</p> <p>1 Dustin Norris</p> <p>2 included in the financial statements. You know,</p> <p>3 I -- I think we're going to get into it in our</p> <p>4 affirmative defenses, but we dispute that the</p> <p>5 notes were actually valid notes, and we would say</p> <p>6 that this was an error. These should not have</p> <p>7 been included, but were included in good faith by</p> <p>8 the accounting team who thought that they were</p> <p>9 valid notes.</p> <p>10 Q Okay.</p> <p>11 A So --</p> <p>12 MR. MORRIS: I move to strike</p> <p>13 everything other than the first portion of</p> <p>14 your answer that was responsive to my</p> <p>15 question.</p> <p>16 BY MR. MORRIS:</p> <p>17 Q HCMFA does not dispute that it received</p> <p>18 \$2.4 million from Highland on May 2nd, does it?</p> <p>19 A No.</p> <p>20 Q HCMFA does not dispute that it received</p> <p>21 \$5 million on May 3rd, 2019, does it?</p> <p>22 A No.</p> <p>23 Q Let's just confirm that, if we can.</p> <p>24 MR. MORRIS: Can we put on the</p> <p>25 screen a document that's been marked as</p>	<p>Page 51</p> <p>1 Dustin Norris</p> <p>2 Exhibit 147?</p> <p>3 (Exhibit 147 tendered.)</p> <p>4 BY MR. MORRIS:</p> <p>5 Q Okay. Do you see that this is -- or at</p> <p>6 least this appears to be a bank account statement?</p> <p>7 A Yes. BBVA Compass is a bank, so I'll take</p> <p>8 your representation it's a statement.</p> <p>9 MR. MORRIS: All right. And if we</p> <p>10 can just scroll down.</p> <p>11 All right. Stop right there.</p> <p>12 BY MR. MORRIS:</p> <p>13 Q Do you see that there's a reference on</p> <p>14 May 2nd to a 2.4-million-dollar transfer?</p> <p>15 A I do.</p> <p>16 Q Okay. And is that consistent with your</p> <p>17 testimony just now that on May 2nd, Highland</p> <p>18 transferred \$2.4 million to HCMFA?</p> <p>19 A That's correct.</p> <p>20 Q And lower on the page, the statement shows</p> <p>21 a transfer of \$5 million on May 3rd; correct?</p> <p>22 A Yes.</p> <p>23 Q And that's the payment that HCMFA</p> <p>24 acknowledged -- acknowledges receiving from</p> <p>25 Highland on that day; correct?</p>
<p>Page 52</p> <p>1 Dustin Norris</p> <p>2 A Is this HCMFA's bank statement or is this</p> <p>3 HCMLP's?</p> <p>4 Q No. It's HCMLP's.</p> <p>5 A Okay. It just says "Highland Capital</p> <p>6 Management," and I'm assuming it lines up -- I'm</p> <p>7 assuming this is the transfer, but --</p> <p>8 Q Okay.</p> <p>9 A -- I can't confirm an entity. But we're</p> <p>10 not denying that there was cash received those</p> <p>11 dates from HCMLP.</p> <p>12 Q Okay. And are you aware --</p> <p>13 MR. MORRIS: We can take this down</p> <p>14 now.</p> <p>15 BY MR. MORRIS:</p> <p>16 Q Do you recall that Topic Number 10 asks</p> <p>17 for a witness who can testify about the accounting</p> <p>18 of these transfers?</p> <p>19 A Uh-huh. Yup.</p> <p>20 Q Are you prepared to testify on Topic</p> <p>21 Number 10?</p> <p>22 A Yes.</p> <p>23 Q Can you tell me how HCMFA accounted for</p> <p>24 these payments on its books and records?</p> <p>25 A I can, yeah.</p>	<p>Page 53</p> <p>1 Dustin Norris</p> <p>2 So my understanding of the company's</p> <p>3 position is that -- and -- and it may be helpful</p> <p>4 to provide some additional color leading up to the</p> <p>5 accounting. I don't know if we want to address</p> <p>6 that later in our affirmative defenses, if you</p> <p>7 have a preference there.</p> <p>8 Q I'd just like you to -- maybe it's my</p> <p>9 question, but I just want you to focus on my</p> <p>10 question.</p> <p>11 A Uh-huh.</p> <p>12 Q And that is: First, do you know how HCMFA</p> <p>13 accounted for these two payments in its books and</p> <p>14 records?</p> <p>15 A Yeah. So the HCMLP employees who were</p> <p>16 tasked with creating books and records of the</p> <p>17 adviser, the accounting team recorded, we -- we --</p> <p>18 our position is that is an incorrect recording of</p> <p>19 a payable to HCMLP. And so there was a payable</p> <p>20 booked on the balance sheet of HCMFA by the HCMLP</p> <p>21 accounting team.</p> <p>22 MR. MORRIS: Okay. I'm going to</p> <p>23 move to strike.</p> <p>24 BY MR. MORRIS:</p> <p>25 Q I -- I'd appreciate not having the</p>

<p>Page 54</p> <p>1 Dustin Norris</p> <p>2 commentary. Your counsel can ask those questions</p> <p>3 or if it's responsive to a question. I'm just</p> <p>4 asking a very simple question.</p> <p>5 A Yup.</p> <p>6 Q How -- how did HCMFA record these payments</p> <p>7 on its books and records?</p> <p>8 A Yeah. My understanding is they recorded a</p> <p>9 payable to HCMFP, a liability.</p> <p>10 Q And do you know when HCMFA first</p> <p>11 discovered that the payments were booked on its</p> <p>12 books and records as a liability?</p> <p>13 A Our position is that that was revealed</p> <p>14 through after the -- sorry -- after the demand.</p> <p>15 And as we began to get additional information --</p> <p>16 particularly, and I would refer you to</p> <p>17 Mr. Sauter's declaration, our amended response,</p> <p>18 and our second amended response that was filed</p> <p>19 yesterday regarding each of those time periods.</p> <p>20 But it was after the demand we found out how it</p> <p>21 was booked.</p> <p>22 Q Okay. So just to simplify this: HCMFA's</p> <p>23 books and records recorded the transfers on</p> <p>24 May 2nd and May 3rd as liabilities from HCMFA to</p> <p>25 Highland; correct?</p>	<p>Page 55</p> <p>1 Dustin Norris</p> <p>2 A So my understanding is the audited</p> <p>3 financials recorded in a subsequent event -- you</p> <p>4 showed me that -- they recorded a subsequent</p> <p>5 event. The balance sheet as of 12/31/2018 wasn't</p> <p>6 amended because it was a subsequent event. But on</p> <p>7 their books and records at that time, or</p> <p>8 subsequent to that, they recorded a liability.</p> <p>9 Q And -- and do you know if that liability</p> <p>10 was recorded contemporaneously in May of 2019?</p> <p>11 A I don't know.</p> <p>12 Q But it's -- it's HCMFA's position that,</p> <p>13 notwithstanding the recording of the liability on</p> <p>14 its books and records, that HCMFA didn't learn of</p> <p>15 that fact until after the demand letter was sent</p> <p>16 in December of 2020.</p> <p>17 Do I have that right?</p> <p>18 A Correct.</p> <p>19 Q Okay. Have there been any changes in</p> <p>20 HCMFA's books and records since it learned of the</p> <p>21 promise -- of the existence of the promise --</p> <p>22 withdrawn.</p> <p>23 Has -- has HCMFA changed its books and</p> <p>24 records after learning that the payments were</p> <p>25 recorded as liabilities?</p>
<p>Page 56</p> <p>1 Dustin Norris</p> <p>2 A I'm not aware of how it's been treated</p> <p>3 since then.</p> <p>4 Q Okay.</p> <p>5 MR. RUKAVINA: And, John, no</p> <p>6 urgency, but find some time in the near</p> <p>7 future for the restroom break. The</p> <p>8 morning coffee is working its magic.</p> <p>9 MR. MORRIS: Happy to do it right</p> <p>10 now, Davor.</p> <p>11 THE WITNESS: I can use that, too.</p> <p>12 I'm almost through my water bottle.</p> <p>13 MR. MORRIS: All right. So, look,</p> <p>14 it's 12:05. Let's just come back at 12:15</p> <p>15 or 11:15.</p> <p>16 THE WITNESS: Thank you.</p> <p>17 MR. MORRIS: Thanks so much.</p> <p>18 (Recess from 11:05 a.m. to 11:16 a.m. CST)</p> <p>19 BY MR. MORRIS:</p> <p>20 Q To the best of your knowledge, has HCMFA</p> <p>21 ever changed its books and records in order to</p> <p>22 reverse the booking of the payments that were made</p> <p>23 by Highland in May from liabilities to something</p> <p>24 else?</p> <p>25 A I'm not aware of how the accounting</p>	<p>Page 57</p> <p>1 Dustin Norris</p> <p>2 entries have been done since then, but -- yeah,</p> <p>3 I'm not aware.</p> <p>4 Q Okay. But you'll -- you'll agree that the</p> <p>5 accounting for these two payments was among the</p> <p>6 30(b)(6) topics, correct, Number 11 -- Number 10?</p> <p>7 A Yes.</p> <p>8 Q And as the 30(b)(6) witness for HCMFA, can</p> <p>9 you confirm that, to the best of your knowledge,</p> <p>10 those payments were booked as liabilities and the</p> <p>11 booking of those payments as -- as liabilities has</p> <p>12 not changed?</p> <p>13 A To the best of my knowledge, they were</p> <p>14 booked as liabilities, and I don't know how they</p> <p>15 have been treated. There's not been a year-end</p> <p>16 audit for 2021, and I'm sure the accountants and</p> <p>17 auditors will determine based on current facts and</p> <p>18 circumstances how those will be reported.</p> <p>19 Q Okay. But as of today, you have no</p> <p>20 knowledge that the booking of those payments as</p> <p>21 liabilities has ever been changed; correct?</p> <p>22 A Those -- there's no financial statements</p> <p>23 that are prepared, I believe, intra-year, during</p> <p>24 the year, for audited purposes. And so, you know,</p> <p>25 that -- that would be, I'm sure, determined based</p>

<p>Page 58</p> <p>1 Dustin Norris</p> <p>2 on any audit needs.</p> <p>3 Q Does HCMFA maintain an accounts payable</p> <p>4 ledger?</p> <p>5 A I'm sure it does.</p> <p>6 Q Did you do anything to try to ascertain</p> <p>7 whether or not these notes appear as liabilities</p> <p>8 on the accounts payable ledger?</p> <p>9 A As current accounts payable ledger?</p> <p>10 Q Yeah.</p> <p>11 A No.</p> <p>12 Q Did you -- other than the audited</p> <p>13 financial statements, did you take any steps to</p> <p>14 ascertain how these payments were recorded in</p> <p>15 HCMFA's books and records, or is -- or is it only</p> <p>16 on the audited financial statements?</p> <p>17 A So at the time that they were recorded, we</p> <p>18 know they were recorded as liabilities on the</p> <p>19 books and records.</p> <p>20 Q And when you say that it was recorded as a</p> <p>21 liability in the books and records, where in the</p> <p>22 books and records was it recorded as a liability?</p> <p>23 A Meaning on the balance sheet?</p> <p>24 Q Okay. So the balance sheet is one place;</p> <p>25 is that right?</p>	<p>Page 59</p> <p>1 Dustin Norris</p> <p>2 A Yes. We record liabilities on the balance</p> <p>3 sheet.</p> <p>4 Q Okay. Did HCMFA complete its audit for</p> <p>5 2019?</p> <p>6 A I don't -- not that I'm aware of. I don't</p> <p>7 believe they had an audit for 2019.</p> <p>8 Q Okay. Now, HCMFA contends that the</p> <p>9 payments were -- should not have been booked as a</p> <p>10 loan because they were supposed to be compensation</p> <p>11 for the error that Highland made in connection</p> <p>12 with the NAV error; correct?</p> <p>13 A Correct.</p> <p>14 Q Okay. Did HCMFA ever issue an invoice or</p> <p>15 a bill of any kind to Highland?</p> <p>16 A Not that I'm aware of.</p> <p>17 Q Okay. Is there anything in HCMFA's books</p> <p>18 and records that reflects its position that the</p> <p>19 payments should not have been billed as</p> <p>20 liabilities, but they should have been billed as</p> <p>21 income?</p> <p>22 A As compensation?</p> <p>23 Q Yeah.</p> <p>24 A Yes.</p> <p>25 Anything in their records?</p>
<p>Page 60</p> <p>1 Dustin Norris</p> <p>2 Q Yes.</p> <p>3 A I -- I would refer you to the testimony of</p> <p>4 Mr. Dondero and Mr. Waterhouse, who both testified</p> <p>5 to this; Mr. Dondero that it was compensation, and</p> <p>6 that Frank testified in his deposition that he</p> <p>7 don't -- didn't remember Mr. Dondero saying it was</p> <p>8 a loan, and that Mr. Dondero told him to get the</p> <p>9 money from Highland. And so it's -- it's -- that</p> <p>10 is on the record and in the record.</p> <p>11 But in HCMFA's other records, we have</p> <p>12 the president of HCMLP, Jim Dondero, who made that</p> <p>13 transfer and has said that that is for</p> <p>14 compensation.</p> <p>15 So there is -- but there is -- I</p> <p>16 wouldn't -- I would be surprised to see some kind</p> <p>17 of a settlement agreement or invoice with -- to</p> <p>18 affiliates.</p> <p>19 MR. MORRIS: Okay. I move to</p> <p>20 strike.</p> <p>21 BY MR. MORRIS:</p> <p>22 Q And my answer -- my question is really</p> <p>23 simple.</p> <p>24 Is there anything in HCMFA's books and</p> <p>25 records that reflects its position that these</p>	<p>Page 61</p> <p>1 Dustin Norris</p> <p>2 payments were supposed to be made as compensation</p> <p>3 rather than in the form of loans?</p> <p>4 A I -- I would say that the pleadings are a</p> <p>5 part of our books and records now. I would say</p> <p>6 depositions. And within that, it is well</p> <p>7 documented.</p> <p>8 Q Okay. Let me ask a different question</p> <p>9 then.</p> <p>10 Remember we were using the answer date</p> <p>11 as being March 1st, 2021.</p> <p>12 A Correct.</p> <p>13 Q Is there anything in HCMFA's books and</p> <p>14 records that was created prior to March 1st, 2021,</p> <p>15 that corroborates HCMFA's position that the</p> <p>16 payments were intended to be compensation and not</p> <p>17 in the form of a loan?</p> <p>18 A Yeah, and I would, again, refer you to</p> <p>19 DC's -- what do you call it -- declaration. That</p> <p>20 prior to that, we didn't have access to -- to,</p> <p>21 largely, our books and records as that was</p> <p>22 outsourced to Highland Capital Management, LP, and</p> <p>23 to their employees, legal, compliance, and</p> <p>24 accounting. So our position is we did not have</p> <p>25 anything at that point related to this agreement.</p>

<p>Page 62</p> <p>1 Dustin Norris</p> <p>2 MR. MORRIS: Okay. I move to</p> <p>3 strike.</p> <p>4 BY MR. MORRIS:</p> <p>5 Q And listen carefully to my question.</p> <p>6 Is HCMFA aware of anything that was</p> <p>7 created prior to the answer date that corroborates</p> <p>8 its position today that the payments were intended</p> <p>9 to be treated as compensation rather than a loan?</p> <p>10 A I -- I think as far as books and records</p> <p>11 go, we have NAV error memos, we have communication</p> <p>12 with the SEC. Right?</p> <p>13 There's -- there is a lot of</p> <p>14 information related to the services that were</p> <p>15 performed under the shared services agreement,</p> <p>16 were for valuation purposes that Highland had</p> <p>17 created and was responsible for the valuation</p> <p>18 process, and that is a host of documents that are</p> <p>19 in the record, yes.</p> <p>20 MR. MORRIS: Okay. I -- I move to</p> <p>21 strike.</p> <p>22 BY MR. MORRIS:</p> <p>23 Q I'm asking about accounting. Maybe it's</p> <p>24 my fault. Okay? I'll -- I'll take responsibility</p> <p>25 for this. I'm asking as a matter of accounting.</p>	<p>Page 63</p> <p>1 Dustin Norris</p> <p>2 I'm still on 30(b)(6) Topic Number 10.</p> <p>3 Is there anything in HCMFA's books and</p> <p>4 records that was created before the answer date</p> <p>5 that shows that the payment should have been</p> <p>6 accounted for as compensation rather than as a</p> <p>7 loan?</p> <p>8 A As far as an accounting record, I wouldn't</p> <p>9 expect there to be, because the accountant</p> <p>10 function was outsourced to HCMLP, and -- and I</p> <p>11 would refer you to our latest response and our</p> <p>12 amended response of -- of what was discovered and</p> <p>13 found throughout the process here.</p> <p>14 The accountants recorded a liability</p> <p>15 and they thought it should be liability. And so,</p> <p>16 no, there wasn't anything, to my knowledge, prior</p> <p>17 to that that was in the accounting books and</p> <p>18 records. And I -- you know, I'm not surprised</p> <p>19 there wasn't, because of the facts that you'll --</p> <p>20 you'll see in our amended answers.</p> <p>21 Q Okay. Do you know whether, if it was</p> <p>22 intended to be compensation, that HCMFA's income</p> <p>23 statement should have shown the inflow of the</p> <p>24 \$7.4 million?</p> <p>25 A I don't know how it would be reported for</p>
<p>Page 64</p> <p>1 Dustin Norris</p> <p>2 accounting purposes. I -- I do have an accounting</p> <p>3 background, but I haven't done accounting in a</p> <p>4 long time, and I'm not an expert in adviser</p> <p>5 financial statements. So I would say I don't</p> <p>6 have -- and I guess -- I guess that -- stepping</p> <p>7 back and answering on behalf of the company here,</p> <p>8 I don't have a knowledge of how that would be</p> <p>9 recorded for income statement purposes.</p> <p>10 Q Okay.</p> <p>11 A But it would -- it would be compensation</p> <p>12 that would be reported --</p> <p>13 Q Okay.</p> <p>14 A -- somewhere in the financial statements.</p> <p>15 Q So it's your testimony today, as HCMFA's</p> <p>16 30(b)(6) witness, that HCMFA was unaware that its</p> <p>17 audited financial statements disclosed these notes</p> <p>18 until after the lawsuit was commenced.</p> <p>19 Do I have that right?</p> <p>20 A That's correct.</p> <p>21 Q And it's your position today, as HCMFA's</p> <p>22 30(b)(6) witness, that HCMFA was unaware that the</p> <p>23 payments that were made by Highland were booked as</p> <p>24 liabilities until sometime after the lawsuit was</p> <p>25 commenced; correct?</p>	<p>Page 65</p> <p>1 Dustin Norris</p> <p>2 A Yes, that's correct. The accounting</p> <p>3 function was outsourced to HCMLP.</p> <p>4 Q Okay. And there's -- was there anybody --</p> <p>5 was there any officer of HCMFA who had</p> <p>6 responsibility for reviewing HCMFA's balance</p> <p>7 sheet?</p> <p>8 A I believe I already answered this earlier.</p> <p>9 Q I actually asked the question on the</p> <p>10 audited financial statements.</p> <p>11 A Okay.</p> <p>12 Q Now I'm going to ask specifically. Is</p> <p>13 there anybody who served as an officer of HCMFA</p> <p>14 who had the responsibility of making sure that</p> <p>15 HCMFA's balance sheets were true and accurate?</p> <p>16 A Yes. So Frank Waterhouse and his team,</p> <p>17 Frank was the named treasurer of HCMFA, and his</p> <p>18 role at HCMLP, as a service provider, would have</p> <p>19 had that responsibility along with his team.</p> <p>20 Q Okay. Let's go to the next topic,</p> <p>21 Topic 11. Do you see Topic 11 refers to</p> <p>22 "communications in 2020 with any retail board --</p> <p>23 A Yes.</p> <p>24 Q -- concerning the amounts due and owing to</p> <p>25 Highland"?</p>

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 66</p> <p>1 Dustin Norris</p> <p>2 A Yes, I do.</p> <p>3 Q Okay. HCMFA is a financial advisory firm;</p> <p>4 correct?</p> <p>5 A It is.</p> <p>6 Q And it provides advisory services to</p> <p>7 certain funds; correct?</p> <p>8 A It does.</p> <p>9 Q And those advisory services are provided</p> <p>10 pursuant to written agreements; correct?</p> <p>11 A They are.</p> <p>12 Q And those agreements are subject to annual</p> <p>13 review; correct?</p> <p>14 A They are.</p> <p>15 Q And those agreements the principal source</p> <p>16 of HCMFA's revenue?</p> <p>17 A Yes, I believe so.</p> <p>18 Q Okay. It's among the most important</p> <p>19 contracts HCMFA has; correct?</p> <p>20 A Yes.</p> <p>21 Q In fact, it's the reason for HCMFA's</p> <p>22 existence, is that fair, is to serve the funds?</p> <p>23 A Largely, yes.</p> <p>24 Q And the funds are managed by boards;</p> <p>25 correct?</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 67</p> <p>1 Dustin Norris</p> <p>2 A Correct.</p> <p>3 Q And can we refer to the boards that manage</p> <p>4 the funds that are served by the advisers as "the</p> <p>5 retail board"?</p> <p>6 A Yes.</p> <p>7 Q Okay. Did you participate -- are you</p> <p>8 aware that in the fall of 2020 the retail board</p> <p>9 conducted a review in connection with the</p> <p>10 determination as to whether or not to renew</p> <p>11 HCMFA's contracts?</p> <p>12 A I am aware, yes.</p> <p>13 Q Did you participate in that process?</p> <p>14 A I did, in some -- in some parts, yes.</p> <p>15 Q What parts did you participate in?</p> <p>16 A Yeah, so I attended the board meetings in</p> <p>17 relation to -- we call this the 15(c) analysis.</p> <p>18 And so it's Section 15(c) of the 1940 Act requires</p> <p>19 the board to determine and renew the contracts on</p> <p>20 an annual basis. And so they look at a number of</p> <p>21 factors. And there's, I believe, certain case law</p> <p>22 that dictates the things that they should look at:</p> <p>23 Quality of services, performance, fees.</p> <p>24 And so my aspect -- the biggest part</p> <p>25 of my contribution is to talk about the</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 68</p> <p>1 Dustin Norris</p> <p>2 performance of the funds, how they performed</p> <p>3 during the year. We hire an outside third party</p> <p>4 to come in and talk about performance and fees. I</p> <p>5 help provide insight, talk about -- as I oversee</p> <p>6 the sales and business development of the firm, I</p> <p>7 talk about inflows and outflows, which help --</p> <p>8 helps impact the economies of scale funds. We</p> <p>9 have certain funds that are shrinking, some that</p> <p>10 are growing. So talking about future, talking</p> <p>11 about mergers, talking about different aspects of</p> <p>12 that.</p> <p>13 And so my -- mine is more of the sales</p> <p>14 business development function and regarding the</p> <p>15 services. One of the things that we do as the</p> <p>16 adviser is we, again -- they have to determine</p> <p>17 that the quality of services we're providing are</p> <p>18 sufficient, and so they have to get comfortable</p> <p>19 with the various functions.</p> <p>20 Q Okay. Who else on behalf of HCMFA</p> <p>21 participated in the 15(c) analysis that you've</p> <p>22 just described?</p> <p>23 A Yeah, so as -- again, going back to the</p> <p>24 shared services agreement, I point you to the</p> <p>25 services that are provided by HCMLP. In large</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 69</p> <p>1 Dustin Norris</p> <p>2 part, this process is managed and run by the HCMLP</p> <p>3 employees as part of that shared services. Legal</p> <p>4 and compliance help draft the memos. They are --</p> <p>5 Q And I'm going to interrupt you, and I</p> <p>6 really apologize for doing that. I'm not asking</p> <p>7 about HCMLP.</p> <p>8 A Yeah.</p> <p>9 Q These are -- these are HCMFA's contracts;</p> <p>10 correct?</p> <p>11 A They are.</p> <p>12 Q And they're the most important contracts</p> <p>13 that HCMFA has; correct?</p> <p>14 A Correct.</p> <p>15 Q Okay. So who -- which officers of HCMFA</p> <p>16 are involved in the 15(c) analysis?</p> <p>17 A Yeah, one -- going back to -- to clarify</p> <p>18 on your -- you know, this is the most important</p> <p>19 thing, you know, that we have, it is, and as such</p> <p>20 we have -- a lot of those functions, and to talk</p> <p>21 about HCMFA's role, we have front-office</p> <p>22 investment professionals who join those meetings</p> <p>23 to talk about the funds and performance. The</p> <p>24 aspects of the adviser that we provide and source</p> <p>25 is the management of the funds: The performance,</p>

<p>Page 70</p> <p>1 Dustin Norris</p> <p>2 the investment selection. And then we bring in</p> <p>3 HCMLP to provide the various other services. And</p> <p>4 so they are a huge part of that. To say that --</p> <p>5 yeah, it's not -- they are legal, compliance,</p> <p>6 accounting, finance, back office, settlement.</p> <p>7 Those are all functions that they're providing.</p> <p>8 Q I know -- I appreciate that they're</p> <p>9 functions that they play under the shared services</p> <p>10 agreement.</p> <p>11 A Yup.</p> <p>12 Q Let me -- let me move on.</p> <p>13 A Okay. Go ahead.</p> <p>14 Q In October 2020, HCMFA informed the retail</p> <p>15 board that HCMFA was obligated to pay Highland the</p> <p>16 outstanding principal amount due under the notes;</p> <p>17 correct?</p> <p>18 MR. RUKAVINA: Objection; form.</p> <p>19 THE WITNESS: Yeah, the</p> <p>20 obligated -- I would -- sorry. Can you</p> <p>21 ask the question again?</p> <p>22 BY MR. MORRIS:</p> <p>23 Q Sure.</p> <p>24 In October 2020, HCMFA informed the</p> <p>25 retail board of the existence of the notes;</p>	<p>Page 71</p> <p>1 Dustin Norris</p> <p>2 correct?</p> <p>3 A Not that I'm aware of. If you have</p> <p>4 something you could -- you know, a document or</p> <p>5 something that you're thinking of?</p> <p>6 Q So you participated in the 15(c) process,</p> <p>7 and you have no knowledge of HCMFA informing the</p> <p>8 retail board of the existence of the notes?</p> <p>9 A Of these notes? No. And I would say that</p> <p>10 there was a question from the retail board posed</p> <p>11 to the advisers, which we passed along to HCMLP,</p> <p>12 which included Lauren Thedford as an HCMLP</p> <p>13 employee and Frank Waterhouse, is: Were there any</p> <p>14 liabilities to -- owed to Highland?</p> <p>15 Q So let's take a look -- I'm sorry. Go</p> <p>16 ahead.</p> <p>17 A No, go ahead.</p> <p>18 Q I was going to say, let's take a look at</p> <p>19 that.</p> <p>20 MR. MORRIS: So if we could put up</p> <p>21 on the screen Exhibit 59.</p> <p>22 (Exhibit 59 tendered.)</p> <p>23 BY MR. MORRIS:</p> <p>24 Q Have you seen this document before, sir?</p> <p>25 A I have.</p>
<p>Page 72</p> <p>1 Dustin Norris</p> <p>2 Q And this is the report that the advisers</p> <p>3 gave to the retail board in October 2020 as part</p> <p>4 of the 15(c) analysis; correct?</p> <p>5 A Yes, working closely with HCMLP in the</p> <p>6 accounting, compliance, and legal function did</p> <p>7 draft this.</p> <p>8 Q Okay. And who -- who on behalf of the</p> <p>9 advisers authorized the sending of this memo?</p> <p>10 A I don't know that there's a formal</p> <p>11 authorization. Lauren Thedford, who was the</p> <p>12 secretary of the advisers and an HCMLP employee,</p> <p>13 helped prepare the memo along with the rest of the</p> <p>14 legal and compliance team. Thomas Sargent was</p> <p>15 probably involved.</p> <p>16 MR. MORRIS: Okay. I'm going to</p> <p>17 move to strike.</p> <p>18 BY MR. MORRIS:</p> <p>19 Q I don't want to know who was probably</p> <p>20 involved. I actually asked a very specific</p> <p>21 question, and if you don't know, please just say</p> <p>22 you don't know.</p> <p>23 Who on behalf of the advisers</p> <p>24 authorized the sending of this memo to the retail</p> <p>25 board?</p>	<p>Page 73</p> <p>1 Dustin Norris</p> <p>2 A I don't know.</p> <p>3 Q Did anybody on behalf of the advisers ever</p> <p>4 suggest that this memo was wrong or inaccurate in</p> <p>5 any way to the best of your knowledge?</p> <p>6 A At that time? Is that what you mean?</p> <p>7 Q Yes.</p> <p>8 A No, not -- not to my knowledge.</p> <p>9 Q Okay. When did you see this memo for the</p> <p>10 first time?</p> <p>11 A I may have been copied on it at the time.</p> <p>12 I don't remember if I read it, but I did review</p> <p>13 it -- and actually, I didn't review the whole</p> <p>14 memo. I reviewed the one email that was related</p> <p>15 to the note payable in this. So I don't know that</p> <p>16 I read the whole memo.</p> <p>17 Q So -- so --</p> <p>18 MR. MORRIS: Can we see how long</p> <p>19 the memo is?</p> <p>20 BY MR. MORRIS:</p> <p>21 Q So it's two pages, and it's got some</p> <p>22 charts; is that fair?</p> <p>23 A That's fair.</p> <p>24 Q And in October 2020, you were the</p> <p>25 executive vice president of every single entity</p>

<p>Page 74</p> <p>1 Dustin Norris</p> <p>2 that this email is being sent to and from;</p> <p>3 correct?</p> <p>4 A I'm looking at the entities.</p> <p>5 I'm executive vice president of most</p> <p>6 of the entities.</p> <p>7 Q Okay. You're the executive vice president</p> <p>8 of each of the entities that are sending this</p> <p>9 memo; correct?</p> <p>10 A No. Not NexPoint Securities.</p> <p>11 Q I appreciate that. Thank you for the</p> <p>12 clarification.</p> <p>13 Did you review this before it was</p> <p>14 sent?</p> <p>15 A I don't remember.</p> <p>16 Q Did you take any steps to make sure that</p> <p>17 it was accurate?</p> <p>18 A Probably not. And that wouldn't have been</p> <p>19 my function. We had a legal and compliance team</p> <p>20 that was -- through the shared services agreement</p> <p>21 that prepared memos. This is going to the board.</p> <p>22 That would have all obviously gone through legal</p> <p>23 and compliance. It wouldn't have been my</p> <p>24 function.</p> <p>25 Q Did anybody who served as an officer or</p>	<p>Page 75</p> <p>1 Dustin Norris</p> <p>2 employee of HCMFA have any responsibility to make</p> <p>3 sure that this memo was true and accurate before</p> <p>4 it was sent to the retail board?</p> <p>5 A Lauren Thedford was the secretary of the</p> <p>6 advisers and the funds, and I believe this has to</p> <p>7 do with -- and depending on the material, I think</p> <p>8 this has to do with the note, and other things.</p> <p>9 So the finance team, Frank Waterhouse and his team</p> <p>10 at HCMLP, would have been supplying those answers.</p> <p>11 Q Okay. And why do you keep saying Frank</p> <p>12 Waterhouse at HCMLP instead of Frank Waterhouse as</p> <p>13 the treasurer of the entity that's sending this</p> <p>14 memo?</p> <p>15 A Because Frank was the CFO of Highland who</p> <p>16 was responsible for the accounting, finance,</p> <p>17 back-office functions of these funds. And the</p> <p>18 answer -- the adviser did not have that</p> <p>19 information, and intentionally hired HCMLP to</p> <p>20 provide that function. And so that is how it was</p> <p>21 viewed. Those were HCMLP employees, and that was</p> <p>22 under the shared services agreement.</p> <p>23 Q Is it your testimony as the HCMFA 30(b)(6)</p> <p>24 witness that Frank Waterhouse did not have any</p> <p>25 responsibility in his capacity as the treasurer of</p>
<p>Page 76</p> <p>1 Dustin Norris</p> <p>2 HCMFA to make sure that this report was true and</p> <p>3 accurate before it was sent to the retail board?</p> <p>4 A I don't know of any function or</p> <p>5 requirement of his role as treasurer of HCMFA that</p> <p>6 he was responsible for reviewing 15(c) memos prior</p> <p>7 to going to the board.</p> <p>8 Q And other than Lauren Thedford, you can't</p> <p>9 identify any officer or employee of HCMFA who had</p> <p>10 any responsibility to make sure that this report</p> <p>11 was true and accurate before it was sent; is that</p> <p>12 correct?</p> <p>13 A No. And I can't -- and I would, again, go</p> <p>14 back to legal. And this is a memo that is going</p> <p>15 to the board and is a legal and compliance</p> <p>16 function that would have been provided services by</p> <p>17 HCMLP. And that was always the case. Those</p> <p>18 employees, for years, have provided the</p> <p>19 legal/compliance support of memos of the 15(c)</p> <p>20 process and the support for everything that went</p> <p>21 into it.</p> <p>22 MR. MORRIS: Okay. Move to strike.</p> <p>23 BY MR. MORRIS:</p> <p>24 Q Do you know if Jim Dondero reviewed this</p> <p>25 before it was sent?</p>	<p>Page 77</p> <p>1 Dustin Norris</p> <p>2 A I don't know for sure, but I highly doubt.</p> <p>3 He was never, to my knowledge, involved in</p> <p>4 drafting or reviewing 15(c) memos.</p> <p>5 Q Okay. You'll agree that this memo was</p> <p>6 sent by the advisers in response to the retail</p> <p>7 board's questions; correct?</p> <p>8 A Correct.</p> <p>9 Q And you'll agree --</p> <p>10 A And actually, let me -- let me correct</p> <p>11 that.</p> <p>12 It was from the advisers. I believe</p> <p>13 that HCMLP employees sent it, getting back to --</p> <p>14 it was sent by -- technicality, but I believe</p> <p>15 Lauren Thedford would have sent this.</p> <p>16 Q And why do you say that she sent it in her</p> <p>17 capacity as an HCMLP employee rather than as the</p> <p>18 secretary of the entity that's actually the author</p> <p>19 of the memo?</p> <p>20 A Because that was the function that they</p> <p>21 were providing as part of the shared services</p> <p>22 agreement. And I -- yeah. That was what -- she's</p> <p>23 part of the legal team at HCMLP, and that was the</p> <p>24 service she was providing. We didn't have a legal</p> <p>25 and compliance function at HCMFA.</p>

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 78</p> <p>1 Dustin Norris</p> <p>2 Q Okay.</p> <p>3 MR. MORRIS: Can we scroll down to</p> <p>4 Question 2, please?</p> <p>5 BY MR. MORRIS:</p> <p>6 Q Have you seen Question 2 before?</p> <p>7 A Yes.</p> <p>8 Q Do you have an understanding of what was</p> <p>9 being requested by the retail board in Question</p> <p>10 Number 2?</p> <p>11 A Yes. They are asking for amounts</p> <p>12 currently payable or due in the future to HCMLP by</p> <p>13 HCMFA or NexPoint Advisors.</p> <p>14 Q And -- and did the advisers report to the</p> <p>15 retail board in October 2020 that, quote,</p> <p>16 "\$12,286,000 remains outstanding to HCMLP from</p> <p>17 HCMFA"?</p> <p>18 A It says it right there. That's in the</p> <p>19 memo.</p> <p>20 Q Okay.</p> <p>21 A And I would note that came from Frank</p> <p>22 Waterhouse and his team, that information, the</p> <p>23 accounting department at HCMLP.</p> <p>24 MR. MORRIS: Okay. I move to</p> <p>25 strike everything after the portion of</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 79</p> <p>1 Dustin Norris</p> <p>2 your answer that was responsive to my</p> <p>3 question.</p> <p>4 BY MR. MORRIS:</p> <p>5 Q As HCMFA's 30(b)(6) witness today, have</p> <p>6 you done anything to determine whether or not the</p> <p>7 \$12.286 million number includes the principal</p> <p>8 amount of the notes?</p> <p>9 A Looking at it, we can't tell. Because it</p> <p>10 doesn't line up exactly with those notes. There</p> <p>11 were other notes that had been recorded in the</p> <p>12 books for several years before. And if you add</p> <p>13 those two together, it doesn't add up. So it's</p> <p>14 not clear.</p> <p>15 Q Did you read the testimony of Mr. Klos and</p> <p>16 Ms. Hendrix? I think you said you did; right?</p> <p>17 A I did.</p> <p>18 Q Did you read the portion of their</p> <p>19 testimony where they said that this number</p> <p>20 includes the notes as well as certain other</p> <p>21 amounts that were due and owing to certain</p> <p>22 Highland affiliates?</p> <p>23 A I did -- I didn't read every single line,</p> <p>24 and there were, between the two of them -- I don't</p> <p>25 know -- 600 pages. So if it's in there and you</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 80</p> <p>1 Dustin Norris</p> <p>2 can point to it, then I can take your</p> <p>3 representation. But I don't remember that.</p> <p>4 Q All right. So did anybody acting on</p> <p>5 behalf of HCMFA -- withdrawn.</p> <p>6 Did any officer of -- or employee of</p> <p>7 HCMFA do anything to make sure the information in</p> <p>8 this response was true and accurate before it was</p> <p>9 sent to the retail board?</p> <p>10 A We received it from the individuals</p> <p>11 responsible. And there was no -- you know, there</p> <p>12 was no reason to doubt that it was incorrect.</p> <p>13 Right? These were professionals. We were relying</p> <p>14 on them. This is Frank Waterhouse, Dave Klos,</p> <p>15 Kristen. We anticipated this would be accurate.</p> <p>16 Q Okay. You anticipated it. But it's your</p> <p>17 testimony that no officer or employee of HCMFA did</p> <p>18 anything independently to make sure that it was</p> <p>19 accurate; that they completely and 100 percent</p> <p>20 just deferred and relied on somebody else under a</p> <p>21 contract?</p> <p>22 A Frank Waterhouse was the treasurer. You</p> <p>23 said any -- any officer. He was -- in his role,</p> <p>24 he provided this information. And I don't know</p> <p>25 his extent of how he looked into it, but if you</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 81</p> <p>1 Dustin Norris</p> <p>2 look at the email chain, it didn't look too</p> <p>3 extensive. And if you even look at this, he's</p> <p>4 saying that the earliest the note between HCMLP</p> <p>5 and HCMFA can come due is May 21st. He himself</p> <p>6 seems to be confused here, because as we found out</p> <p>7 through discovery and in the testimony of what has</p> <p>8 come out, there was an agreement -- that was a</p> <p>9 separate agreement. That wasn't related to the</p> <p>10 notes at issue in this case.</p> <p>11 And so I don't know the extent that</p> <p>12 was gone into this, but it -- it -- there's</p> <p>13 confusion even in the response.</p> <p>14 MR. MORRIS: Okay. I move to</p> <p>15 strike.</p> <p>16 BY MR. MORRIS:</p> <p>17 Q Again, I was just asking about the</p> <p>18 identity of anybody who was charged with the</p> <p>19 responsibility of making sure that this was true</p> <p>20 and accurate.</p> <p>21 Is there any officer or employee of</p> <p>22 HCMFA who was charged with the responsibility of</p> <p>23 making sure this response was true and accurate?</p> <p>24 A Yeah. It was sent to -- the request went</p> <p>25 to Frank Waterhouse because he and his team would</p>

<p>Page 82</p> <p>1 Dustin Norris</p> <p>2 have this information. That's -- that's where we</p> <p>3 would get this information.</p> <p>4 Q Okay. Thank you.</p> <p>5 MR. RUKAVINA: Hey, John, let me</p> <p>6 just interject for a little. Let's go off</p> <p>7 the record for just a minute.</p> <p>8 (Discussion off the record.)</p> <p>9 BY MR. MORRIS:</p> <p>10 Q Do you know, as HCMFA's 30(b)(6)</p> <p>11 representative, whether the \$12.286 million</p> <p>12 includes the \$7.5 million -- withdrawn.</p> <p>13 Do you know if the 12. -- withdrawn.</p> <p>14 As HCMFA's 30(b)(6) witness, do you</p> <p>15 know whether the \$12.286 million referenced in</p> <p>16 Response Number 2 includes the \$7.4 million in</p> <p>17 principal amount on the notes?</p> <p>18 A I don't.</p> <p>19 Q Okay. Did you do anything to try to</p> <p>20 answer that question before appearing for today's</p> <p>21 deposition?</p> <p>22 A Yeah. We discussed this with counsel. We</p> <p>23 don't have underlying backup. We couldn't talk to</p> <p>24 Frank Waterhouse on this in preparation, but the</p> <p>25 numbers just don't match up to principal amounts</p>	<p>Page 83</p> <p>1 Dustin Norris</p> <p>2 and what is owing. We don't have information on</p> <p>3 the other notes. So discussed it with counsel,</p> <p>4 but I -- we don't have any backup to support or --</p> <p>5 Q Did you make -- did you make any attempt</p> <p>6 to speak with Ms. Thedford?</p> <p>7 A No, I didn't. And she wouldn't have that</p> <p>8 information. She's an attorney and was involved</p> <p>9 in the legal field, and she's no longer employed</p> <p>10 there or at Skyview.</p> <p>11 MR. MORRIS: I move to strike.</p> <p>12 BY MR. MORRIS:</p> <p>13 Q Okay. And so you don't know what the</p> <p>14 component parts of this \$12.286 million number</p> <p>15 are; correct?</p> <p>16 A I don't.</p> <p>17 Q Okay. Do you see the last sentence of</p> <p>18 this response that says, quote: "The adviser</p> <p>19 notes that both entities have the full faith and</p> <p>20 support of Jim Dondero," close quote?</p> <p>21 A I do.</p> <p>22 Q Do you know what that means?</p> <p>23 A Other than what Frank Waterhouse</p> <p>24 testified -- and I, again, refer you to his</p> <p>25 deposition -- that -- I believe that wording came</p>
<p>Page 84</p> <p>1 Dustin Norris</p> <p>2 from him, and he emailed that. So I would refer</p> <p>3 you to his testimony.</p> <p>4 Q Well, as the 30(b)(6) witness, you were</p> <p>5 asked to be prepared about communications to the</p> <p>6 retail board; correct?</p> <p>7 A Yes.</p> <p>8 Q Okay. Did you do anything to try to</p> <p>9 figure out what that sentence meant -- that</p> <p>10 sentence meant, other than reading Frank</p> <p>11 Waterhouse's deposition transcript?</p> <p>12 A Knowing that it came from Frank, and Frank</p> <p>13 elaborated, I didn't do any additional research.</p> <p>14 Q Did you ask Mr. Dondero if he was aware</p> <p>15 that that statement was included in the report to</p> <p>16 the retail board?</p> <p>17 A I did not.</p> <p>18 Q Do you know why this statement was</p> <p>19 included in the report to the retail board?</p> <p>20 A I could speculate, but I don't know</p> <p>21 specifically.</p> <p>22 Q Do you know if Mr. Dondero authorized the</p> <p>23 advisers to inform the retail board, in October</p> <p>24 of 2020, that the advisers had the full faith and</p> <p>25 support of Mr. Dondero?</p>	<p>Page 85</p> <p>1 Dustin Norris</p> <p>2 A I'm not aware, and if you look at Frank's</p> <p>3 testimony, I believe he testified that he -- he</p> <p>4 didn't have that authority either, but I'm not</p> <p>5 sure. I would refer you to his -- I don't have</p> <p>6 any other knowledge.</p> <p>7 Q Okay. So it's HCMFA's position that the</p> <p>8 statement in the last sentence of Response</p> <p>9 Number 2 was unauthorized. Do I have that</p> <p>10 correctly?</p> <p>11 A I don't know that we're taking that</p> <p>12 position either way. It wasn't something</p> <p>13 that -- that we're -- was even part of the -- our</p> <p>14 arguments.</p> <p>15 Q I'm not asking if it's part of your</p> <p>16 arguments. I'm just asking you, as a factual</p> <p>17 matter, does HCMFA contend that that sentence was</p> <p>18 included without authorization?</p> <p>19 A I don't have the knowledge of that.</p> <p>20 That's -- I'm not going to contend that.</p> <p>21 Q Okay.</p> <p>22 A It may have been. I don't know.</p> <p>23 Q Okay. So this letter was sent over a year</p> <p>24 ago. Do I have that right?</p> <p>25 A What's the date on it?</p>

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 86</p> <p>1 Dustin Norris</p> <p>2 MR. MORRIS: If we can go back to</p> <p>3 the top.</p> <p>4 THE WITNESS: Yup.</p> <p>5 BY MR. MORRIS:</p> <p>6 Q Okay. Has -- have the advisers ever told</p> <p>7 the retail board that the response to Question</p> <p>8 Number 2 was inaccurate in any way?</p> <p>9 A Specifically saying, "Hey, let me tell you</p> <p>10 this memo, Question 2, let me go back, it was</p> <p>11 inaccurate," no, that was never a specific</p> <p>12 disclosure of the retail board.</p> <p>13 However, the retail board is aware of</p> <p>14 all of the facts and circumstances surrounding the</p> <p>15 notes, and so they're aware of our position.</p> <p>16 They're aware of -- they've been demanded.</p> <p>17 There's been a lawsuit involved on both notes.</p> <p>18 And -- and -- but, no, this specific</p> <p>19 Number 2 is incorrect, no. But they're aware of</p> <p>20 our position and what we found out since then.</p> <p>21 Q Okay. Earlier in 2020, before this memo</p> <p>22 was sent to the retail board, HCMFA had provided</p> <p>23 to the retail board its financial statements for</p> <p>24 the period ending June 30, 2020; correct?</p> <p>25 A I believe that's typical in our August</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 87</p> <p>1 Dustin Norris</p> <p>2 meeting as part of the 15(c) process, but -- I</p> <p>3 don't know if you have that in hand, but I believe</p> <p>4 that was supplied. I'm not certain. Sometimes it</p> <p>5 was 12/31 balance sheets, sometimes it was a</p> <p>6 June 30th balance sheet.</p> <p>7 Q Okay. Can we -- are you aware -- have you</p> <p>8 seen an email exchange that preceded the -- the</p> <p>9 finalization of this memo to the retail board?</p> <p>10 A I believe it was part of your exhibits.</p> <p>11 Q All right.</p> <p>12 MR. MORRIS: So let's put that up</p> <p>13 on the screen, Exhibit 36.</p> <p>14 (Exhibit 36 tendered.)</p> <p>15 BY MR. MORRIS:</p> <p>16 Q So is this the document that you've seen</p> <p>17 before?</p> <p>18 A Yes.</p> <p>19 Q Okay.</p> <p>20 MR. MORRIS: And can we start at</p> <p>21 the bottom of the document?</p> <p>22 BY MR. MORRIS:</p> <p>23 Q Okay. And do you know who Stacy from</p> <p>24 Blank Rome is?</p> <p>25 A I do.</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 88</p> <p>1 Dustin Norris</p> <p>2 Q And who is that?</p> <p>3 A She is independent counsel for the retail</p> <p>4 board, the independent directors.</p> <p>5 Q And did she provide to the people on this</p> <p>6 email string certain questions that the retail</p> <p>7 board had in connection with its annual 15(c)</p> <p>8 review?</p> <p>9 A Yes. These were follow-up requests. So</p> <p>10 they have a memo that she provides early on with</p> <p>11 an extensive list of questions, and these were the</p> <p>12 follow-up questions from the board.</p> <p>13 Q Okay. And so it was sent to you,</p> <p>14 actually; correct?</p> <p>15 A To me and Lauren.</p> <p>16 MR. MORRIS: Can we scroll up a</p> <p>17 little bit, please? Keep going.</p> <p>18 BY MR. MORRIS:</p> <p>19 Q And then Lauren forwards it to certain</p> <p>20 people, including you; correct?</p> <p>21 A She forwards it to Thomas and copies me.</p> <p>22 Q Uh-huh. And -- and she includes the</p> <p>23 questions that are being asked by the retail</p> <p>24 board; correct?</p> <p>25 A I don't know if -- I don't know if that's</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 89</p> <p>1 Dustin Norris</p> <p>2 all of them. I don't know if you have the memo.</p> <p>3 If you represent that is all the questions,</p> <p>4 then --</p> <p>5 Q Yeah.</p> <p>6 A -- then I'll take that representation,</p> <p>7 but --</p> <p>8 Q And -- and Question Number 2 is the same</p> <p>9 Question Number 2 that we just looked at in the</p> <p>10 report that was given to the retail board;</p> <p>11 correct?</p> <p>12 A I don't know if it's exact, but -- I don't</p> <p>13 know if you want to pull that up.</p> <p>14 Q Don't you have a copy of it with you right</p> <p>15 there?</p> <p>16 A I don't know if I have a copy of that.</p> <p>17 Oh, I have the exhibits. What exhibit was that?</p> <p>18 I have it in PDF.</p> <p>19 Q Yeah, that's -- that was 59.</p> <p>20 A I'm scrolling. There are 650 pages here.</p> <p>21 Sorry. Which exhibit again?</p> <p>22 Q You know, let's just move on.</p> <p>23 Is it fair to say that Ms. Thedford</p> <p>24 forwarded to Mr. Surgent, you, and others,</p> <p>25 questions that had been presented by Stacy, the</p>

<p>Page 90</p> <p>1 Dustin Norris</p> <p>2 retail board's outside counsel?</p> <p>3 A Just one correction there. She forwarded</p> <p>4 it to Mr. Surgent and copied me.</p> <p>5 Q Fair enough.</p> <p>6 A I'm not on the "To" line. That would</p> <p>7 be --</p> <p>8 MR. MORRIS: Let's scroll down,</p> <p>9 please. Let's scroll.</p> <p>10 BY MR. MORRIS:</p> <p>11 Q And then -- and then she forwards it</p> <p>12 further to Mr. Waterhouse, Mr. Klos, and</p> <p>13 Ms. Hendrix.</p> <p>14 Do you see that?</p> <p>15 A I do.</p> <p>16 Q And you're still copied on it; correct?</p> <p>17 A I am.</p> <p>18 Q And do you see that she's asking Frank,</p> <p>19 Mr. Klos, and Kristin to respond to Question</p> <p>20 Number 2 that concerns material outstanding</p> <p>21 amounts currently payable or due in the future to</p> <p>22 Highland or its affiliates by either of the</p> <p>23 advisers?</p> <p>24 A Yes, it -- HCMLP will take that as a typo.</p> <p>25 But yes. And that would be standard. Lauren</p>	<p>Page 91</p> <p>1 Dustin Norris</p> <p>2 would go to them as the source for that</p> <p>3 information.</p> <p>4 Q Okay.</p> <p>5 MR. MORRIS: And let's scroll up</p> <p>6 and see the response.</p> <p>7 BY MR. MORRIS:</p> <p>8 Q And do you see Mr. Waterhouse responded</p> <p>9 with one word: "Yes"?</p> <p>10 A Yes, I see that.</p> <p>11 Q And then Ms. Thedford asked if</p> <p>12 Mr. Waterhouse could provide the amounts.</p> <p>13 Do you see that?</p> <p>14 A I do.</p> <p>15 Q And you're still copied on this email</p> <p>16 chain; correct?</p> <p>17 A I am.</p> <p>18 Q So --</p> <p>19 A Which, again, is not unusual to copy me on</p> <p>20 some things I wish they wouldn't. But I was</p> <p>21 copied on board items fairly regularly.</p> <p>22 MR. MORRIS: Okay. I move to</p> <p>23 strike.</p> <p>24 BY MR. MORRIS:</p> <p>25 Q I appreciate your wishes, but the question</p>
<p>Page 92</p> <p>1 Dustin Norris</p> <p>2 was simply whether or not, you know, you would</p> <p>3 acknowledge that you were copied on this email.</p> <p>4 A Yup, that's my email.</p> <p>5 Q Okay. And let's see what the next</p> <p>6 response is.</p> <p>7 And do you see Mr. Waterhouse</p> <p>8 responds -- can you read Mr. Waterhouse's</p> <p>9 response?</p> <p>10 A I can. He said: "It's on the balance</p> <p>11 sheet that was provided the board as part of the</p> <p>12 15(c) materials."</p> <p>13 Q Okay. So everybody to whom Mr. Waterhouse</p> <p>14 has sent -- withdrawn.</p> <p>15 So you don't dispute, as HCMFA's</p> <p>16 30(b)(6) witness, that Mr. Waterhouse informed all</p> <p>17 of the recipients of his email on Tuesday,</p> <p>18 October 6th, 2020, at 6:05 p.m. that the answer to</p> <p>19 the retail board's Question Number 2 could be</p> <p>20 found in HCMFA's balance sheet; correct?</p> <p>21 A Correct.</p> <p>22 Q Okay. Let's go --</p> <p>23 A Actually, can you go back down to the</p> <p>24 answer -- the exact question?</p> <p>25 Q Of course.</p>	<p>Page 93</p> <p>1 Dustin Norris</p> <p>2 Okay.</p> <p>3 A "Are there material outstanding amounts</p> <p>4 currently payable or due to the future by HCMLP to</p> <p>5 HCMFA" -- yeah -- "or any other affiliate?"</p> <p>6 Okay.</p> <p>7 Q Having read that, does that change your</p> <p>8 answer at all?</p> <p>9 A And so -- go back to your original</p> <p>10 question on whether his --</p> <p>11 Q Right. So Mr. --</p> <p>12 MR. MORRIS: Can we scroll back up</p> <p>13 to Mr. Waterhouse's response?</p> <p>14 BY MR. MORRIS:</p> <p>15 Q Thank you for your patience, Mr. Norris.</p> <p>16 A Uh-huh.</p> <p>17 Q You'll see that Mr. Waterhouse responds at</p> <p>18 6:05 p.m. on October 6th, and my question is a</p> <p>19 simple one: Does HCMFA dispute that in</p> <p>20 Mr. Waterhouse's email that he is telling the</p> <p>21 recipients that the answer to the retail board's</p> <p>22 Question Number 2 can be found in HCMFA's balance</p> <p>23 sheet?</p> <p>24 A I would say the answer -- his -- his</p> <p>25 response is the answer to the retail board is not</p>

<p>Page 94</p> <p>1 Dustin Norris</p> <p>2 completely accurate, because there was -- there's</p> <p>3 not enough there to be responsive. I think what</p> <p>4 he's saying here is to Lauren, "Hey, it's on the</p> <p>5 balance sheet. Can you look at it and figure it</p> <p>6 out?"</p> <p>7 And I -- I think they go back and</p> <p>8 forth, "Well, can you give us more information?"</p> <p>9 And so it's -- this is not responsive to the</p> <p>10 question and isn't what was provided to the board,</p> <p>11 but that's --</p> <p>12 Q Well, let -- let's see what Ms. Thedford</p> <p>13 does. Ms. Thedford's the lawyer, right?</p> <p>14 A She is.</p> <p>15 Q Yeah. But she's also the secretary of</p> <p>16 HCMFA; correct?</p> <p>17 A At this time, I believe so, yes.</p> <p>18 Q And you wouldn't dispute that she is</p> <p>19 taking the lead on formulating the advisers'</p> <p>20 response to the retail board; correct?</p> <p>21 A I would not dispute that.</p> <p>22 Q Okay. And do you see that she reports to</p> <p>23 you and everybody else in her email that she has</p> <p>24 taken information from the 6/30 financials?</p> <p>25 A Yes, I see the below from the 6/30</p>	<p>Page 95</p> <p>1 Dustin Norris</p> <p>2 financials. And, again, to correct to me, I'm</p> <p>3 CC'd. It's a nuance, but she's representing to</p> <p>4 Frank and Dave and Kristin with a CC to me.</p> <p>5 Q Okay. Does HCMFA acknowledge that the</p> <p>6 information contained in the October 23rd, 2020,</p> <p>7 report to the retail board with respect to</p> <p>8 Question Number 2 was derived from HCMFA's</p> <p>9 June 30th, 2020, financials?</p> <p>10 A Sorry. One more time?</p> <p>11 Q Will you agree, as HCMFA's 30(b)(6)</p> <p>12 witness, that the information provided to the</p> <p>13 retail board in October 2020 in response to</p> <p>14 Question Number 2 was taken directly from HCMFA's</p> <p>15 financial statements for the period ending</p> <p>16 June 30th, 2020?</p> <p>17 A Yeah. The unaudited financials, yes.</p> <p>18 Q Okay. And so -- so as HCMFA's 30(b)(6)</p> <p>19 witness, you will agree that the \$12,286,000</p> <p>20 figure that was included in the former response to</p> <p>21 the retail board was obtained from HCMFA's</p> <p>22 unaudited financial statements for the period</p> <p>23 ending June 30th, 2020; correct?</p> <p>24 A It appears that way.</p> <p>25 And I -- I think -- and, again, we're</p>
<p>Page 96</p> <p>1 Dustin Norris</p> <p>2 looking at a draft answer here. I don't have the</p> <p>3 final answer. But it looks as work product that</p> <p>4 she's pulling numbers from the unaudited balance</p> <p>5 sheet and plugging them in here.</p> <p>6 Q Okay. And we can look at the final if you</p> <p>7 want, but that \$12,286,000 number that was due to</p> <p>8 HCMLP as of June 30th 2020, that's the exact</p> <p>9 figure that was given to the retail board in the</p> <p>10 final report; correct?</p> <p>11 A "Final report," meaning the final memo --</p> <p>12 final memos?</p> <p>13 Q Yes.</p> <p>14 A Yes. Yes, I believe so.</p> <p>15 Q Okay.</p> <p>16 MR. MORRIS: Can you scroll back up</p> <p>17 to the last email?</p> <p>18 BY MR. MORRIS:</p> <p>19 Q So this is Mr. Waterhouse's response to</p> <p>20 Ms. Thedford. And, again, Mr. Waterhouse is</p> <p>21 Highland's CFO and the advisers' treasurer;</p> <p>22 correct?</p> <p>23 A Correct.</p> <p>24 Q And at this time, Ms. Thedford is an</p> <p>25 attorney at Highland, but she also serves as the</p>	<p>Page 97</p> <p>1 Dustin Norris</p> <p>2 secretary for the advisers; correct?</p> <p>3 A That's correct.</p> <p>4 Q And you are the executive vice president</p> <p>5 for the advisers; correct?</p> <p>6 A As of this date, yes.</p> <p>7 Q And you had no position with Highland;</p> <p>8 correct?</p> <p>9 A At this time?</p> <p>10 Q Correct.</p> <p>11 A No position with Highland, no.</p> <p>12 Q Okay. How about Mr. Post? Had he</p> <p>13 transitioned from Highland to the advisers as of</p> <p>14 October 6th?</p> <p>15 A I don't believe so.</p> <p>16 Q Okay. It happened in October, though;</p> <p>17 right?</p> <p>18 A I -- I don't know.</p> <p>19 Q Okay.</p> <p>20 A Late October/November. It was late in the</p> <p>21 year.</p> <p>22 Q Okay. And do you know if anybody ever</p> <p>23 told Mr. Waterhouse in October 2020 that there was</p> <p>24 any aspect of his email that was incorrect?</p> <p>25 A Not at that time, no, that I'm -- not that</p>

<p>Page 98</p> <p>1 Dustin Norris</p> <p>2 I'm aware of.</p> <p>3 Q Okay.</p> <p>4 A And -- and would we have reason to doubt</p> <p>5 him? This -- he was the source of the</p> <p>6 information.</p> <p>7 Q Okay. And do you see that the last</p> <p>8 sentence of his email actually refers to the last</p> <p>9 sentence of Response Number 2 that was given to</p> <p>10 the retail board later in October 2020?</p> <p>11 A I do.</p> <p>12 Q Did you ever ask Mr. Waterhouse anything</p> <p>13 about that last sentence?</p> <p>14 A I don't believe so.</p> <p>15 Q Do you see that he says, quote: "The</p> <p>16 response should include, as I covered in the board</p> <p>17 meeting, that both entities have the full faith</p> <p>18 and backing from Jim Dondero, and to my knowledge</p> <p>19 that hasn't changed"?</p> <p>20 Do you see that?</p> <p>21 A I do.</p> <p>22 Q Do you know what board meeting he's</p> <p>23 referring to?</p> <p>24 A "The response should include, as I covered</p> <p>25 in the board meeting, that both entities have a</p>	<p>Page 99</p> <p>1 Dustin Norris</p> <p>2 full faith and backing."</p> <p>3 So I don't know the exact board</p> <p>4 meeting. However, we do have an August board</p> <p>5 meeting related to 15(c). There's typically an</p> <p>6 in-person or telephonic meeting in August, and</p> <p>7 then there's a September board meeting that is</p> <p>8 devoted almost exclusively to the 15(c) process.</p> <p>9 And after that, there is follow-up</p> <p>10 meetings -- multiple sometimes, particularly in</p> <p>11 2020 during the bankruptcy proceedings that --</p> <p>12 where the board was getting comfortable. So it</p> <p>13 would have been one of those meetings, but I don't</p> <p>14 know which one.</p> <p>15 Q And -- and did you personally participate</p> <p>16 in a board meeting where Mr. Waterhouse covered</p> <p>17 the topic of the advisers having the full faith</p> <p>18 and backing from Mr. Dondero?</p> <p>19 A I -- I probably would have been in most or</p> <p>20 all of those board meetings, but I don't remember</p> <p>21 that specifically.</p> <p>22 Q Okay. Do you know -- do you know whether</p> <p>23 anybody who's copied on this email ever questioned</p> <p>24 any aspect of the last sentence of</p> <p>25 Mr. Waterhouse's email at any time prior to the</p>
<p>Page 100</p> <p>1 Dustin Norris</p> <p>2 sending of the final memo on October 23rd?</p> <p>3 A Not that I'm aware of.</p> <p>4 Q You didn't; isn't that right?</p> <p>5 A I don't know that I read it, but I didn't</p> <p>6 question it. If I -- I either didn't read it or I</p> <p>7 didn't question it.</p> <p>8 Q Okay. So you have no recollection of ever</p> <p>9 asking Mr. Waterhouse what he meant by the last</p> <p>10 sentence of this email; correct?</p> <p>11 A No, I have no recollection.</p> <p>12 Q And you have no recollection of any</p> <p>13 recipient of this email asking Mr. Waterhouse what</p> <p>14 he meant by that last sentence; correct?</p> <p>15 A I don't remember.</p> <p>16 Q And you never told Mr. Waterhouse that you</p> <p>17 had no knowledge of him having covered this issue</p> <p>18 before the board?</p> <p>19 A You're wondering if I ever told him I had</p> <p>20 no knowledge?</p> <p>21 Q Yeah.</p> <p>22 A No, I never talked to him about that.</p> <p>23 Q And to the best of your knowledge, no</p> <p>24 recipient of this email ever challenged</p> <p>25 Mr. Waterhouse's statement in this last sentence;</p>	<p>Page 101</p> <p>1 Dustin Norris</p> <p>2 correct?</p> <p>3 A I don't know what the conversations were</p> <p>4 had between the others, but I have no knowledge of</p> <p>5 that.</p> <p>6 Q Okay.</p> <p>7 A And -- and you've got -- sorry. Go ahead.</p> <p>8 Q This email string is -- is an email string</p> <p>9 devoted for the sole purpose of addressing</p> <p>10 questions posed by the retail board in connection</p> <p>11 with the 15(c) review; correct?</p> <p>12 A I believe so.</p> <p>13 Q Okay. Have you ever seen HCMFA's</p> <p>14 unaudited financial statements for June 30th,</p> <p>15 2020?</p> <p>16 A Yes.</p> <p>17 Q And do you know if those audited --</p> <p>18 unaudited financial statements included the</p> <p>19 amounts due and payable under the notes?</p> <p>20 A I -- I think that -- I -- I don't</p> <p>21 remember, but I think our position is it's</p> <p>22 unclear, because the amounts don't agree to</p> <p>23 the -- again, we have prior notes, we have these</p> <p>24 notes. The amounts don't line up.</p> <p>25 So it's -- it's -- the underlying</p>

<p>Page 102</p> <p>1 Dustin Norris</p> <p>2 backing is not provided. There's no footnotes.</p> <p>3 It's just a number that says due to HCMLP.</p> <p>4 Q Do you know -- do you know -- do you have</p> <p>5 any recollection as to the totality of HCMFA's</p> <p>6 liabilities as of June 30th, 2020?</p> <p>7 A Including this note? Or just this note?</p> <p>8 Q All -- all liabilities. What's the bottom</p> <p>9 of the balance sheet?</p> <p>10 A I don't know. Do you have it? Do you</p> <p>11 want to pull it up?</p> <p>12 Q I don't.</p> <p>13 A Yeah, I don't remember.</p> <p>14 MR. RUKAVINA: Hey, John, it's</p> <p>15 approaching 12:15. Just whenever, you</p> <p>16 know --</p> <p>17 MR. MORRIS: Yeah. You know what?</p> <p>18 I was just about to change topics, so this</p> <p>19 is a good time.</p> <p>20 MR. RUKAVINA: Okay.</p> <p>21 MR. MORRIS: Why don't we stop</p> <p>22 here, and we'll come back at the top of</p> <p>23 the hour.</p> <p>24 MR. RUKAVINA: Excellent. Thank</p> <p>25 you.</p>	<p>Page 103</p> <p>1 Dustin Norris</p> <p>2 (Recess from 12:11 p.m. to 1:06 p.m. CST)</p> <p>3 BY MR. MORRIS:</p> <p>4 Q Mr. Norris, Topic Number 9 relates to</p> <p>5 consent fees.</p> <p>6 Do you understand that?</p> <p>7 A I do.</p> <p>8 Q Do you have an understanding of what a</p> <p>9 "consent fee" is?</p> <p>10 A I do.</p> <p>11 Q Did you do anything to prepare for this</p> <p>12 particular topic?</p> <p>13 A I did.</p> <p>14 Q What did you do to prepare for this topic?</p> <p>15 A I discussed the consent fee with</p> <p>16 Mr. Dondero, with Mr. Rukavina, and with</p> <p>17 Mr. Sauter.</p> <p>18 Q Okay. Mr. Sauter has no personal</p> <p>19 knowledge of any consent fee that was paid in the</p> <p>20 spring of 2019; correct?</p> <p>21 A No.</p> <p>22 Q Okay. What's your understanding of what a</p> <p>23 "consent fee" is?</p> <p>24 A Generally or the specific consent fee</p> <p>25 in -- that --</p>
<p>Page 104</p> <p>1 Dustin Norris</p> <p>2 Q Let's start generally.</p> <p>3 A Yeah. So a "consent fee" is a fee paid to</p> <p>4 a -- paid to someone who's agreeing to amend terms</p> <p>5 or change the structure of the -- of a document or</p> <p>6 a loan. In -- in bank loan world, or loan world,</p> <p>7 if you are going to amend or extend or change the</p> <p>8 terms, typically there was a consent fee paid to</p> <p>9 those willing to consent.</p> <p>10 Those that have voted or consented</p> <p>11 receive a fee.</p> <p>12 Q Okay. And did HCMFA pay any consent fees</p> <p>13 in or around April or May 2019?</p> <p>14 A It began to pay consent fees in May</p> <p>15 of 2019, I believe.</p> <p>16 Q Okay. Are you looking at something as you</p> <p>17 prepare your answer?</p> <p>18 A Yeah. I'm looking at Topic Number 9 that</p> <p>19 says consent fee in April or May 2019.</p> <p>20 Q Okay. Thank you so much.</p> <p>21 And -- and I think you testified that</p> <p>22 they began paying consent fees at around that</p> <p>23 time?</p> <p>24 A That's right.</p> <p>25 Q What do you mean by that?</p>	<p>Page 105</p> <p>1 Dustin Norris</p> <p>2 A Yeah. So the consent fee was related to</p> <p>3 the global allocation fund that converted from an</p> <p>4 open-end fund to a closed-end fund, and there was</p> <p>5 a 3 percent fee that would be paid to investors</p> <p>6 that, one, consented to the conversion from an</p> <p>7 open-end fund to a closed-end fund, but also held</p> <p>8 their investment through the conversion.</p> <p>9 The conversion was finalized in</p> <p>10 February of 2019, and the consent fee was an</p> <p>11 operational challenge because you had to determine</p> <p>12 who the investors were that voted yes and that</p> <p>13 held on to the conversion.</p> <p>14 So with that, the -- the amounts that</p> <p>15 were paid, there was an operational challenge to</p> <p>16 determine who -- who needed to be paid, and so</p> <p>17 they were deposited and then paid out over a</p> <p>18 couple-month period.</p> <p>19 Q And who made the decision to pay the</p> <p>20 consent fee?</p> <p>21 A So the consent fee was a collaborative</p> <p>22 decision of senior management. Jim Dondero and</p> <p>23 myself were involved in the decision, the</p> <p>24 discussion to -- and it was a novel idea in terms</p> <p>25 of converting from an open-end fund to a</p>

<p>Page 106</p> <p>1 Dustin Norris</p> <p>2 closed-end fund, and it was submitted to</p> <p>3 investors. It went through SEC review as a proxy</p> <p>4 statement, and it went out to shareholders who</p> <p>5 needed to vote for the proposal.</p> <p>6 Q And who paid the consent fee? HCMFA?</p> <p>7 A My understanding is HCMFA as the adviser</p> <p>8 of the global allocation fund paid the consent fee</p> <p>9 to investors.</p> <p>10 Q And whose idea was it to seek consent to</p> <p>11 change from an open fund to a closed-end fund?</p> <p>12 A I -- I would say it was collaborative of</p> <p>13 senior management. Jim Dondero, myself, legal</p> <p>14 compliance was involved. It was, you know, Mark</p> <p>15 Okada, who was a partner at the time. There was a</p> <p>16 lot of discussion involved.</p> <p>17 Q And when the decision was made to seek</p> <p>18 consent to change from an open-end fund to a</p> <p>19 closed-end fund, did HCMFA understand that there</p> <p>20 would be costs, fees, and expenses associated with</p> <p>21 that decision?</p> <p>22 A Being cost fees as in the consent fee?</p> <p>23 Q Correct.</p> <p>24 A Yes.</p> <p>25 Q And did it undertake any analysis to</p>	<p>Page 107</p> <p>1 Dustin Norris</p> <p>2 determine what the likely total fee would be?</p> <p>3 A Yeah. I'm sure they did.</p> <p>4 Q Do you know what the total fee</p> <p>5 paid -- what the total consent fee paid was?</p> <p>6 A I don't have the exact amount, but it was</p> <p>7 over \$5 million.</p> <p>8 Q Okay. And over what period of time were</p> <p>9 the consent fees paid?</p> <p>10 A I know they were paid in May and June, and</p> <p>11 there may be a portion that were paid thereafter,</p> <p>12 but at least May and June of 2019. There were</p> <p>13 certain broker-dealers that reported later, and</p> <p>14 when those were reported and verified, they were</p> <p>15 paid out. I don't remember the final date of the</p> <p>16 last distribution.</p> <p>17 Q Okay. And forgive me. It's not my</p> <p>18 business. But were the consent fees paid to the</p> <p>19 fund's shareholders?</p> <p>20 A They were paid to the shareholders.</p> <p>21 That's correct.</p> <p>22 Q Okay.</p> <p>23 A That's consented. The shareholders had to</p> <p>24 vote, and they had to be a shareholder on</p> <p>25 conversion date.</p>
<p>Page 108</p> <p>1 Dustin Norris</p> <p>2 Q Okay. And the decision to seek and obtain</p> <p>3 consent, was that a voluntary decision by HCMFA?</p> <p>4 A To seek consent to move to a closed-end</p> <p>5 fund?</p> <p>6 Q Yes. That's not something that any</p> <p>7 regulator required, was it?</p> <p>8 A No.</p> <p>9 Q It's not something that any rule or</p> <p>10 anybody mandated; correct?</p> <p>11 A Not that I believe.</p> <p>12 Q Okay. How did HCMFA fund the payment of</p> <p>13 the total consent fee of over \$5 million?</p> <p>14 A Yeah, from cash that it had on the balance</p> <p>15 sheet.</p> <p>16 Q And where did it get the cash that was on</p> <p>17 the balance sheet?</p> <p>18 A The cash came from the transaction that we</p> <p>19 discussed earlier -- and you showed the capital</p> <p>20 coming in from Highland -- which was compensation</p> <p>21 for the NAV error.</p> <p>22 Q So it used the money that it received in</p> <p>23 the transfers that we talked about to pay the</p> <p>24 consent fee. Do I have that right? Or at least</p> <p>25 some of it?</p>	<p>Page 109</p> <p>1 Dustin Norris</p> <p>2 A Yes.</p> <p>3 Q And, in fact, it used approximately</p> <p>4 \$5 million of the moneys paid in May 2019 to pay</p> <p>5 the consent fee of approximately \$5 million; is</p> <p>6 that fair?</p> <p>7 A At least \$5 million.</p> <p>8 Q Okay. Do you know the exact number?</p> <p>9 A Of the consent fee?</p> <p>10 Q Withdrawn.</p> <p>11 Do you have a better or more precise</p> <p>12 estimate of the total consent fee other than</p> <p>13 \$5 million?</p> <p>14 A It was over \$5 million. I don't remember</p> <p>15 the exact amount, whether it was 5.6 or 5.2 --</p> <p>16 Q All right.</p> <p>17 A -- because it was paid over time.</p> <p>18 Q Let's talk about the TerreStar valuation</p> <p>19 issue for a few minutes, if we can.</p> <p>20 A Okay.</p> <p>21 Q Just generally, in 2018/2019, HCMFA spent</p> <p>22 a fair amount of time addressing the consequences</p> <p>23 of a valuation error concerning TerreStar. Do I</p> <p>24 have that right?</p> <p>25 A There was a lot in there, but there was,</p>

<p>Page 110</p> <p>1 Dustin Norris</p> <p>2 during that time, a lot of discussions with</p> <p>3 TerreStar over the concerns of a valuation error</p> <p>4 in 2018 and '19.</p> <p>5 Q And did it ultimately turn out that there</p> <p>6 was a valuation error involving TerreStar?</p> <p>7 A There was.</p> <p>8 Q Okay. And had HCMFA retained Houlihan</p> <p>9 Lokey in connection with doing the TerreStar</p> <p>10 valuation?</p> <p>11 A Houlihan Lokey was involved in the</p> <p>12 valuation, yes.</p> <p>13 Q And who retained Houlihan Lokey?</p> <p>14 A I don't know.</p> <p>15 Q As you sit here right now, you can't tell</p> <p>16 me who retained Houlihan Lokey?</p> <p>17 A I don't know if it was HCMLP or HCMFA</p> <p>18 or -- I don't know.</p> <p>19 Q Okay. Are you familiar with the firm</p> <p>20 Houlihan Lokey?</p> <p>21 A I am.</p> <p>22 Q And do you know what services they</p> <p>23 provided in connection with the TerreStar</p> <p>24 valuation?</p> <p>25 A I do.</p>	<p>Page 111</p> <p>1 Dustin Norris</p> <p>2 Q Can you describe for me the services that</p> <p>3 were provided by Houlihan Lokey in connection with</p> <p>4 the TerreStar --</p> <p>5 A And I would say I do generally. I was not</p> <p>6 involved in the individual details. That was all</p> <p>7 the HCMLP employees.</p> <p>8 So all of the Highland employees that</p> <p>9 were involved in the shared services agreement,</p> <p>10 the valuation committee, valuation services were</p> <p>11 the responsibility of HCMLP. Key inputs were</p> <p>12 provided by HCMLP. Key estimates and</p> <p>13 interpretations to Houlihan, and they used their</p> <p>14 models to calculate a valuation that was then</p> <p>15 approved by the valuation committee at HCMLP.</p> <p>16 And so that's my general understanding</p> <p>17 of the valuation process.</p> <p>18 Q Do you know how much Houlihan Lokey was</p> <p>19 paid for its work?</p> <p>20 A I don't.</p> <p>21 Q Do you know if there's an engagement</p> <p>22 letter pursuant to which Houlihan Lokey provided</p> <p>23 these services?</p> <p>24 A I'm not aware.</p> <p>25 Q Would you dispute that HCMFA is the entity</p>
<p>Page 112</p> <p>1 Dustin Norris</p> <p>2 that retained Houlihan Lokey?</p> <p>3 A I don't know.</p> <p>4 Q Would you agree that Houlihan Lokey is</p> <p>5 fairly described as an independent third-party</p> <p>6 valuation consultant?</p> <p>7 A Yes, generally.</p> <p>8 Q Okay. And do you know when Houlihan Lokey</p> <p>9 was retained?</p> <p>10 A I don't.</p> <p>11 Q Houlihan Lokey's retention was approved by</p> <p>12 the retail board, wasn't it?</p> <p>13 A I'm not sure.</p> <p>14 Q Have you ever seen any of the work product</p> <p>15 of Houlihan Lokey in connection with the TerreStar</p> <p>16 valuation?</p> <p>17 A Yeah. I remember seeing the valuation</p> <p>18 model.</p> <p>19 Q So Houlihan Lokey did prepare the</p> <p>20 valuation model that is the subject of the</p> <p>21 TerreStar valuation issue; is that fair?</p> <p>22 A Working very closely with the HCMLP</p> <p>23 employees with the inputs, yes.</p> <p>24 Q Did HCMFA rely on the Houlihan Lokey</p> <p>25 valuation model?</p>	<p>Page 113</p> <p>1 Dustin Norris</p> <p>2 A I'm not sure.</p> <p>3 Q Does HCMFA contend that Houlihan Lokey</p> <p>4 made any mistakes in connection with its valuation</p> <p>5 services?</p> <p>6 A I'm not sure.</p> <p>7 Q Does HCMFA have a position as to whether</p> <p>8 or not Houlihan Lokey made any mistakes in any of</p> <p>9 the services that it performed in connection with</p> <p>10 the TerreStar valuation?</p> <p>11 A I think they don't have details and would</p> <p>12 retain their rights to understand what their role</p> <p>13 and -- sorry. What was the original question?</p> <p>14 Q Just whether HCMFA has a position as to</p> <p>15 whether or not Houlihan Lokey made any mistakes in</p> <p>16 the work that it did in connection with the</p> <p>17 TerreStar valuation?</p> <p>18 A Yeah. I think they're retaining their</p> <p>19 rights to understand that better.</p> <p>20 Q Is there any agreement with Houlihan Lokey</p> <p>21 that would give HCMFA the time to do that? Is</p> <p>22 there a tolling agreement or anything like that?</p> <p>23 A Not that I'm aware of.</p> <p>24 Q Is HCMFA undertaking any analysis to</p> <p>25 determine whether or not Houlihan Lokey made any</p>

<p>Page 114</p> <p>1 Dustin Norris</p> <p>2 mistakes in connection with the work that it did</p> <p>3 on the TerreStar valuation?</p> <p>4 A Sorry. One more time.</p> <p>5 Q Is HCMFA undertaking any analysis or</p> <p>6 investigation to try to determine whether Houlihan</p> <p>7 Lokey made any mistakes?</p> <p>8 A There are -- I don't know. I don't know.</p> <p>9 Q You have no knowledge, as you sit here</p> <p>10 today, as to whether HCMFA is undertaking any</p> <p>11 analysis or investigation to try to determine</p> <p>12 whether Houlihan Lokey did anything wrong in</p> <p>13 connection with its valuation services; correct?</p> <p>14 A And I wasn't prepared -- I don't think</p> <p>15 this is one of the topics -- you know, Houlihan</p> <p>16 Lokey's, you know, involvement, and so I wasn't</p> <p>17 prepared to answer that one.</p> <p>18 Q Okay. Well, the defense -- HCMFA's</p> <p>19 defense is that Highland is responsible for the</p> <p>20 TerreStar valuation issue; correct?</p> <p>21 A Yes.</p> <p>22 Q And there's no question that Houlihan</p> <p>23 Lokey provided services in connection with that</p> <p>24 valuation; correct?</p> <p>25 A Correct.</p>	<p>Page 115</p> <p>1 Dustin Norris</p> <p>2 Q But HCMFA has not undertaken any analysis</p> <p>3 or investigation, to the best of your knowledge,</p> <p>4 to try to determine if Houlihan Lokey was the</p> <p>5 responsible party; fair?</p> <p>6 A We don't know if there is a contract or</p> <p>7 not. At this point, we're talking about the</p> <p>8 defense of Highland's responsibility. There's no</p> <p>9 question they were responsible for the valuations.</p> <p>10 They were outsource provider of the valuation</p> <p>11 committee. Every individual working and</p> <p>12 coordinating with Houlihan Lokey was an HCMFA</p> <p>13 employee. All the data and information that was</p> <p>14 provided to them came from HCMLP. There's no</p> <p>15 question that Highland was responsible for the NAV</p> <p>16 error. No one ever questioned that. That was</p> <p>17 always known. It was all the employees that were</p> <p>18 involved.</p> <p>19 MR. RUKAVINA: John, I'll just</p> <p>20 reiterate that we did not understand your</p> <p>21 topics to include Houlihan Lokey. If you</p> <p>22 need more information about that or if we</p> <p>23 need to have a supplemental deposition,</p> <p>24 that's fine. But this is just not</p> <p>25 something that we reasonably anticipated</p>
<p>Page 116</p> <p>1 Dustin Norris</p> <p>2 you asking about.</p> <p>3 MR. MORRIS: I think it's -- I</p> <p>4 think I have the answer that I need and</p> <p>5 that the executive vice president and</p> <p>6 30(b)(6) witness has no knowledge of any</p> <p>7 investigation or analysis that has been</p> <p>8 undertaken by HCMFA to try to even</p> <p>9 determine whether Houlihan Lokey is at</p> <p>10 fault.</p> <p>11 BY MR. MORRIS:</p> <p>12 Q Do I have that right, Mr. Norris?</p> <p>13 MR. RUKAVINA: Well, I will just</p> <p>14 object that that was not your prior</p> <p>15 question.</p> <p>16 MR. MORRIS: All right. Well,</p> <p>17 that's my question now.</p> <p>18 BY MR. MORRIS:</p> <p>19 Q Is that correct, Mr. Norris?</p> <p>20 A I know there's been discussion with</p> <p>21 counsel.</p> <p>22 MR. RUKAVINA: Well, I will</p> <p>23 represent to you that we have looked for a</p> <p>24 Houlihan Lokey contract and have not been</p> <p>25 able to find one. Otherwise, we would</p>	<p>Page 117</p> <p>1 Dustin Norris</p> <p>2 have produced it to you. So if you have</p> <p>3 anything like that, we'd love to see it.</p> <p>4 We do not even know whether we had a</p> <p>5 contract with Houlihan Lokey or not. So</p> <p>6 we'll try to find you information, John.</p> <p>7 We just -- we just don't have it.</p> <p>8 MR. MORRIS: We'll get to that in a</p> <p>9 moment.</p> <p>10 BY MR. MORRIS:</p> <p>11 Q Has HCMFA -- withdrawn.</p> <p>12 Has HCMFA ever told Houlihan Lokey</p> <p>13 that it believed it made any mistake or error of</p> <p>14 any kind in connection with its work on the</p> <p>15 TerreStar valuation?</p> <p>16 A Again, I -- this is not a topic that we</p> <p>17 reviewed, so I don't know.</p> <p>18 Q Okay. You're not aware of anything today;</p> <p>19 correct?</p> <p>20 A Again, the employees working with Houlihan</p> <p>21 Lokey were the HCMLP employees. So I don't know</p> <p>22 if the debtor employees have that conversation,</p> <p>23 but --</p> <p>24 MR. MORRIS: Yeah, I'm going to</p> <p>25 move to strike.</p>

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 118</p> <p>1 Dustin Norris</p> <p>2 BY MR. MORRIS:</p> <p>3 Q And I'm asking about HCMFA.</p> <p>4 Did -- has HCMFA ever informed</p> <p>5 Houlihan Lokey that HCMFA believes that Houlihan</p> <p>6 Lokey made a mistake or error in the work that it</p> <p>7 did?</p> <p>8 A There were ongoing discussions extensively</p> <p>9 throughout this with Houlihan Lokey and the debtor</p> <p>10 employees regarding the error and what the causes</p> <p>11 were. It was extensive discussions.</p> <p>12 MR. MORRIS: Okay. Move to strike.</p> <p>13 BY MR. MORRIS:</p> <p>14 Q Has HCMFA ever told Houlihan Lokey that</p> <p>15 HCMFA believes that Houlihan Lokey made a mistake</p> <p>16 or an error in connection with its valuation</p> <p>17 services?</p> <p>18 A It may have, but I'm not aware.</p> <p>19 Q Thank you.</p> <p>20 Are you familiar with the report that</p> <p>21 HCMFA prepared and sent to the Global Allocation</p> <p>22 Fund concerning the TerreStar valuation issues?</p> <p>23 A They sent to the fund?</p> <p>24 Q Uh-huh.</p> <p>25 A What do you mean "they sent to the fund"?</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 119</p> <p>1 Dustin Norris</p> <p>2 Q They sent to the board of the fund?</p> <p>3 A Oh, the board of the fund.</p> <p>4 There were a number of memos and</p> <p>5 presentations. If you have one you want to pull</p> <p>6 up, you can -- we can refer to it.</p> <p>7 Q Sure.</p> <p>8 MR. MORRIS: Let's put up what</p> <p>9 we've marked as Exhibit 182.</p> <p>10 (Exhibit 182 tendered.)</p> <p>11 BY MR. MORRIS:</p> <p>12 Q And while we're doing that, have you ever</p> <p>13 seen a single document anywhere at any time in</p> <p>14 which any representative of HCMFA took Highland to</p> <p>15 task for the work that it did in connection with</p> <p>16 the TerreStar valuation?</p> <p>17 A "Took them to task"? Define "take them to</p> <p>18 task."</p> <p>19 Q Told them that they were the source and</p> <p>20 cause of the NAV error.</p> <p>21 A The irony of all of the reporting to the</p> <p>22 board, all of the valuation knowledge was from</p> <p>23 HCMLP's employees. We -- we outsourced that to</p> <p>24 them. There was -- there was no question that</p> <p>25 they were at fault, and that's -- every employee</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 120</p> <p>1 Dustin Norris</p> <p>2 involved was an HCMLP employee.</p> <p>3 MR. MORRIS: I move to strike.</p> <p>4 BY MR. MORRIS:</p> <p>5 Q And I'm going to ask you, sir, to listen</p> <p>6 carefully to my question.</p> <p>7 Have you ever seen a document that</p> <p>8 HCMFA sent to Highland in which HCMFA accused</p> <p>9 Highland of being the cause of the NAV error?</p> <p>10 A I have not.</p> <p>11 Q Thank you.</p> <p>12 Do you see the document that's on the</p> <p>13 screen?</p> <p>14 A I do.</p> <p>15 Q Before I get to that, so the NAV error</p> <p>16 occurred sometime prior to May 2019; correct?</p> <p>17 A Beginning -- I don't know the specific</p> <p>18 dates. I believe it began in May of 2019 --</p> <p>19 sorry. May 2019 --</p> <p>20 Q That's when it ended; right?</p> <p>21 A What's that?</p> <p>22 Q That's when it ended; right? That's --</p> <p>23 A Yeah, it was before May 2019.</p> <p>24 Q Okay. So during the entire time that the</p> <p>25 TerreStar NAV error was being discussed and</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 121</p> <p>1 Dustin Norris</p> <p>2 analyzed and debated and communications with the</p> <p>3 SEC, during that entire period, Jim Dondero was in</p> <p>4 control of both HCMFA and Highland; correct?</p> <p>5 A Yes, I believe so.</p> <p>6 Q Okay. Can you identify any employee of</p> <p>7 Highland who was fired as a result of any of the</p> <p>8 mistakes that were made in connection with the</p> <p>9 TerreStar valuation?</p> <p>10 A No.</p> <p>11 Q Can you identify --</p> <p>12 A Not that I can remember.</p> <p>13 Q Can you identify any steps that</p> <p>14 Mr. Dondero took against any employee who was</p> <p>15 allegedly involved in the NAV error?</p> <p>16 A That would have been an HCMLP matter. I</p> <p>17 don't have any knowledge of HCMLP's hiring or</p> <p>18 firing practices.</p> <p>19 Q Okay. So at no time did anybody ever tell</p> <p>20 you that any disciplinary measures were imposed</p> <p>21 upon any Highland employee as a result of the NAV</p> <p>22 error that Highland allegedly caused; correct?</p> <p>23 A Any firing practice? Is that what you</p> <p>24 said?</p> <p>25 Q Disciplinary. Firing. Anything.</p>

<p>Page 122</p> <p>1 Dustin Norris</p> <p>2 A There was a remediation process that had</p> <p>3 to go into effect, which was improvement of</p> <p>4 controls, and they maybe even hired additional</p> <p>5 people. But it was -- and I don't -- I'm not</p> <p>6 aware of any disciplinary, but there could have</p> <p>7 been.</p> <p>8 Q Okay. But that would just be speculation</p> <p>9 on your part; correct?</p> <p>10 A Yeah.</p> <p>11 Q So have you seen the document that's up on</p> <p>12 the screen?</p> <p>13 A I have.</p> <p>14 Q Did you read it before it was sent?</p> <p>15 A I don't think so.</p> <p>16 Q Did anybody -- did any officer or employee</p> <p>17 take responsibility for making sure that --</p> <p>18 withdrawn.</p> <p>19 What is this document?</p> <p>20 A It is titled "Resolution of the Funds Net</p> <p>21 Asset Value Error."</p> <p>22 Q And was -- is it your understanding that</p> <p>23 the purpose of this document was to enable HCMFA</p> <p>24 to explain to the Global Allocation Fund how the</p> <p>25 resolution of the NAV error was being conducted?</p>	<p>Page 123</p> <p>1 Dustin Norris</p> <p>2 A Not to the Global Allocation Fund. This</p> <p>3 is a memo to the board.</p> <p>4 Q Thank you for the clarification.</p> <p>5 Subject to that clarification, is my</p> <p>6 description otherwise correct?</p> <p>7 A I believe so. There had been a number of</p> <p>8 communications with the board, and this is the</p> <p>9 resolution of the whole process, or most of the</p> <p>10 process.</p> <p>11 Q This was a pretty big issue for HCMFA,</p> <p>12 wasn't it?</p> <p>13 A There was a lot of people involved. It</p> <p>14 was -- there was a lot of involvement from --</p> <p>15 mostly Highland Capital Management, LP, employees,</p> <p>16 but it was -- there was a lot involved.</p> <p>17 Q And who -- what outside counsel was</p> <p>18 retained?</p> <p>19 A Adviser counsel is counsel -- is -- I</p> <p>20 believe it was K&L Gates for HCMFA.</p> <p>21 Q And who was Highland's counsel?</p> <p>22 A I don't know.</p> <p>23 Q Do you know if Highland had counsel?</p> <p>24 A I don't know.</p> <p>25 Q Do you --</p>
<p>Page 124</p> <p>1 Dustin Norris</p> <p>2 A I know they had counsel they referred to</p> <p>3 for SEC matters, and I don't know if they utilized</p> <p>4 them here or not. They were all Highland</p> <p>5 employees that worked on this. So I'm sure you</p> <p>6 probably have that in your records.</p> <p>7 Q Sir, can you identify any outside counsel</p> <p>8 that was retained by Highland to advise it in</p> <p>9 connection with the TerreStar valuation issues</p> <p>10 that were the subject of an SEC investigation?</p> <p>11 A I have -- I have no knowledge of that.</p> <p>12 Q Okay. Did you see this memo that's up on</p> <p>13 the screen that's been marked as Exhibit 182 prior</p> <p>14 to the time that it was sent?</p> <p>15 A I don't recall.</p> <p>16 Q The NAV error was the subject of an SEC</p> <p>17 investigation; correct?</p> <p>18 A Correct.</p> <p>19 Q Do you know if HCMFA ever told the SEC</p> <p>20 orally, in writing, or otherwise that Highland</p> <p>21 Capital Management, LP, was the cause of the NAV</p> <p>22 error?</p> <p>23 A Not that I'm aware of, but they were</p> <p>24 concerned about the ultimate correction of the NAV</p> <p>25 error. I don't think they were concerned about</p>	<p>Page 125</p> <p>1 Dustin Norris</p> <p>2 the responsible party.</p> <p>3 But I would say every single person</p> <p>4 that interacted with the SEC, I believe, were</p> <p>5 HCMLP employees. We can see that on the other</p> <p>6 memo that they have to the SEC following up on a</p> <p>7 call; all HCMLP employees. So whether they told</p> <p>8 them or not, they were all HCMLP employees.</p> <p>9 MR. MORRIS: Okay. Move to strike</p> <p>10 after the very first portion of the answer</p> <p>11 that was responsive.</p> <p>12 BY MR. MORRIS:</p> <p>13 Q Did anybody -- did any officer or employee</p> <p>14 of HCMFA ever inform the SEC that Highland Capital</p> <p>15 Management, LP, was the responsible party for the</p> <p>16 NAV error?</p> <p>17 A Specifically, not that I'm aware of.</p> <p>18 Q Okay. Was any HCMFA officer or employee</p> <p>19 responsible for making sure that the memorandum up</p> <p>20 on the screen that's been marked as 182 was true</p> <p>21 and accurate before it was sent to the board of</p> <p>22 the Highland Global Allocation Fund?</p> <p>23 A I don't know that there is a -- there's a</p> <p>24 specific requirement of an officer to verify the</p> <p>25 accuracy.</p>

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 126</p> <p>1 Dustin Norris</p> <p>2 Q Okay. But my question was a little bit</p> <p>3 broader, and that was whether there was any</p> <p>4 officer or employee who was given the</p> <p>5 responsibility of making sure this document was</p> <p>6 true and accurate before it was sent to the board</p> <p>7 of the GAF.</p> <p>8 A I don't even know who drafted this. It</p> <p>9 would have come from Highland's compliance legal</p> <p>10 and accounting team with all the expertise around</p> <p>11 the NAV error and all of those that were involved.</p> <p>12 Q So did you see this document at or around</p> <p>13 the time it was sent to the GAF board?</p> <p>14 A I probably did.</p> <p>15 Q Do you recall telling anybody at that time</p> <p>16 that you believed there were any errors in the</p> <p>17 document?</p> <p>18 A I think, as I testified before, I</p> <p>19 don't -- I don't remember reading it. But I</p> <p>20 didn't -- I didn't say there were errors in the</p> <p>21 document, no.</p> <p>22 Q Prior to the answer date of March 1st,</p> <p>23 2021, did anybody acting on behalf of HCMFA ever</p> <p>24 tell anybody in the world at any time that there</p> <p>25 was any error in this memorandum?</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 127</p> <p>1 Dustin Norris</p> <p>2 A Not that I'm aware of.</p> <p>3 Q Did HCMFA send this memorandum --</p> <p>4 withdrawn.</p> <p>5 Did HCMFA intend this -- withdrawn.</p> <p>6 Did HCMFA expect the GAF board to rely</p> <p>7 on this memorandum?</p> <p>8 A I don't know what the intention was.</p> <p>9 Q You don't know what HCMFA's intention was</p> <p>10 in sending this memorandum?</p> <p>11 A If it's addressed to the board, it could</p> <p>12 be to educate. But I'm sure that the board</p> <p>13 would -- would rely on or expect that that memo</p> <p>14 would be accurate.</p> <p>15 Q Okay. And this is dated after all of the</p> <p>16 payments have been made that we've been talking</p> <p>17 about, the May 2nd and the May 3rd payments;</p> <p>18 correct?</p> <p>19 A Correct.</p> <p>20 Q Take a look at the second paragraph.</p> <p>21 A Yup.</p> <p>22 Q Do you see the first sentence refers to</p> <p>23 two initial determinations that were made by the</p> <p>24 adviser and Houlihan Lokey?</p> <p>25 A Sorry. Which part? Just the first</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 128</p> <p>1 Dustin Norris</p> <p>2 sentence of the second paragraph?</p> <p>3 Q Yeah. First of all, do you see that the</p> <p>4 second paragraph refers to the adviser and</p> <p>5 Houlihan Lokey?</p> <p>6 A It does.</p> <p>7 Q And do you see that the reference to</p> <p>8 Houlihan Lokey includes a reference to Houlihan</p> <p>9 Lokey having been approved by the board?</p> <p>10 A Yes.</p> <p>11 Q And do you understand that that means the</p> <p>12 board of GAF?</p> <p>13 A Yes.</p> <p>14 Q Does that refresh your recollection that</p> <p>15 the GAF board approved of the retention of</p> <p>16 Houlihan Lokey as an independent third-party</p> <p>17 expert valuation consultant?</p> <p>18 A It doesn't refresh my recollection, but it</p> <p>19 says it there. I don't know that I have a</p> <p>20 document saying they -- I haven't seen the</p> <p>21 approval, the agreement.</p> <p>22 Q But you don't dispute that this memo was</p> <p>23 sent to the GAF board on or about May 28th, 2019;</p> <p>24 correct?</p> <p>25 A Correct.</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 129</p> <p>1 Dustin Norris</p> <p>2 Q Okay. And HCMFA told the GAF board at</p> <p>3 that time that HCMFA and Houlihan Lokey, quote,</p> <p>4 "initially determined that the March transactions</p> <p>5 were non-orderly and should be given zero</p> <p>6 weighting for purposes of fair value."</p> <p>7 Is that correct?</p> <p>8 A The HCMFP, as part of the valuation -- or</p> <p>9 as the outsource valuation provider, were the</p> <p>10 employees that made that determination. The</p> <p>11 adviser ultimately has the responsibility, but it</p> <p>12 was outsourced. And those were HCMFP employees,</p> <p>13 along with Houlihan Lokey, that determined the</p> <p>14 March transactions were non-orderly.</p> <p>15 MR. MORRIS: I'm going to move to</p> <p>16 strike.</p> <p>17 BY MR. MORRIS:</p> <p>18 Q And I'm going to ask you to listen</p> <p>19 carefully to my question.</p> <p>20 I'm asking you what HCMFA told the GAF</p> <p>21 board. Did HCMFA tell the GAF board on May 28th,</p> <p>22 2019, that HCMFA and Houlihan Lokey, quote,</p> <p>23 "initially determined that the March transactions</p> <p>24 were non-orderly and should be given zero</p> <p>25 weighting for purposes of determining fair value."</p>

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 130</p> <p>1 Dustin Norris</p> <p>2 Is that correct?</p> <p>3 A The -- in the memo, it says that on this</p> <p>4 date, there were many other conversations probably</p> <p>5 around this date and on this date discussing the</p> <p>6 determinations and non-orderly and that it was the</p> <p>7 HCMLP employees, and the board knew that. They</p> <p>8 were very aware that it was the -- the valuation</p> <p>9 control environment of HCMLP that determined these</p> <p>10 were non-orderly transactions.</p> <p>11 Q So this -- so this report is inaccurate,</p> <p>12 according to you?</p> <p>13 A No. There's -- there's just -- your</p> <p>14 question was did they tell the board. There is a</p> <p>15 lot that we told the board outside of this memo.</p> <p>16 This memo does say advised from Houlihan Lokey.</p> <p>17 The adviser is ultimately responsible. But there</p> <p>18 was a lot of communication with the board --</p> <p>19 Q Okay.</p> <p>20 A -- around this, that they knew exactly who</p> <p>21 was responsible for valuation as the board</p> <p>22 determining that these were market transactions</p> <p>23 and orderly or non-orderly.</p> <p>24 Q Okay. I want to focus on this memo,</p> <p>25 because this is the one that I have. And you'll</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 131</p> <p>1 Dustin Norris</p> <p>2 agree with me that there's no reference to</p> <p>3 Highland Capital Management, LP, anywhere in this</p> <p>4 report; correct?</p> <p>5 A No, there's not, but the board knew that</p> <p>6 HCMLP was preparing the valuations.</p> <p>7 MR. MORRIS: All right. I move to</p> <p>8 strike after the word "no."</p> <p>9 BY MR. MORRIS:</p> <p>10 Q And it was the determination concerning</p> <p>11 whether or not it was orderly or non-orderly, and</p> <p>12 whether or not to use zero weighting that were the</p> <p>13 two causes of the NAV error; correct?</p> <p>14 A Those were key portions.</p> <p>15 Q In the last sentence, in fact, that's the</p> <p>16 only portions; isn't that fair?</p> <p>17 A "Initially determined" -- well, it doesn't</p> <p>18 say that there's not other factors. They're the</p> <p>19 only ones mentioned.</p> <p>20 Q Let me -- let me -- let me read the last</p> <p>21 sentence.</p> <p>22 Quote: "The orderly determination and</p> <p>23 adoption of the weighted fair value methodology</p> <p>24 resulted in NAV errors in the fund," and that's</p> <p>25 what it's defining as the NAV error.</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 132</p> <p>1 Dustin Norris</p> <p>2 Have I read that correctly?</p> <p>3 A You did.</p> <p>4 Q And so would you agree with me, as HCMFA's</p> <p>5 30(b)(6) witness, that on May 28th, 2019, HCMFA</p> <p>6 told the GAF board that the two causes of the NAV</p> <p>7 error were the orderly determination and the</p> <p>8 adoption of the weighted fair value methodology --</p> <p>9 fair value -- fair valuation methodology?</p> <p>10 A Those were -- it doesn't say those are</p> <p>11 exclusively the only factors, but those are</p> <p>12 mentioned here.</p> <p>13 Q It says those two factors resulted in the</p> <p>14 NAV error; correct?</p> <p>15 A Those -- no, it didn't say "the NAV</p> <p>16 error." It said "in NAV errors."</p> <p>17 Q Which it's defining as the NAV error;</p> <p>18 correct?</p> <p>19 A Defines as "the NAV error."</p> <p>20 Q Okay. Does HCMFA contend that there's</p> <p>21 anything in this paragraph that is inaccurate?</p> <p>22 A Again, I -- I don't know that Houlihan</p> <p>23 Lokey was approved by the board, but I don't know</p> <p>24 of any other contention.</p> <p>25 Q Okay. And you don't -- and HCMFA doesn't</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 133</p> <p>1 Dustin Norris</p> <p>2 dispute that Houlihan Lokey was approved by the</p> <p>3 board. You're just telling me that, as you sit</p> <p>4 here today, that's the one fact that you've not</p> <p>5 been able to confirm; is that fair?</p> <p>6 A As far as I know, yeah.</p> <p>7 Q Okay. Let's go on to the next paragraph.</p> <p>8 MR. MORRIS: If we could just</p> <p>9 scroll up a little bit.</p> <p>10 BY MR. MORRIS:</p> <p>11 Q I'm going to try and summarize here, but</p> <p>12 if you don't think it's a fair summary, of course</p> <p>13 I would encourage you to let me know.</p> <p>14 Is it fair to say that, as a general</p> <p>15 matter, the next paragraph describes a total loss</p> <p>16 from the NAV error as being approximately</p> <p>17 \$7.5 million?</p> <p>18 A Yeah, including processing costs and</p> <p>19 rebates and offsets, yes.</p> <p>20 Q Right. That's what the parenthetical</p> <p>21 says, a total loss --</p> <p>22 A Yup.</p> <p>23 Q -- of approximately \$7.5 million?</p> <p>24 A Correct.</p> <p>25 Q And the next paragraph states that that</p>

<p>Page 134</p> <p>1 Dustin Norris</p> <p>2 loss was funded with two payments. Do I have that</p> <p>3 correct in the first sentence?</p> <p>4 A Correct.</p> <p>5 Q Okay. Did HCMFA pay approximately</p> <p>6 \$5.186 million on or around February 15, 2019, in</p> <p>7 connection with the NAV error?</p> <p>8 A I believe so.</p> <p>9 And if we go to the next page, it has</p> <p>10 dates and payments. I think it's represented</p> <p>11 there.</p> <p>12 Q Okay. Where did HCMFA get the money to</p> <p>13 make that payment?</p> <p>14 A A combination of insurance proceeds and</p> <p>15 cash that it had. And, again, that's detailed, I</p> <p>16 believe, on the next page.</p> <p>17 Q HCMFA contends that the \$7.4 million</p> <p>18 transferred by Highland to HCMFA was mistakenly</p> <p>19 recorded as a loan; correct?</p> <p>20 A There's -- there's two different amounts</p> <p>21 that we contend were recorded as a note, a</p> <p>22 combined 7.4 million, yes.</p> <p>23 Q Okay. And HCMFA contends that the</p> <p>24 \$7.4 million in payments was not to be a loan, but</p> <p>25 was supposed to be compensation for Highland's</p>	<p>Page 135</p> <p>1 Dustin Norris</p> <p>2 negligent valuation services in connection with</p> <p>3 the NAV error; correct?</p> <p>4 A Sorry. One more time.</p> <p>5 Q HCMFA contends that the \$7.4 million in</p> <p>6 payments was supposed to be compensation resulting</p> <p>7 from Highland's negligent valuation services;</p> <p>8 correct?</p> <p>9 A Yes, subject to all of our defenses that</p> <p>10 we've laid out in our pleadings.</p> <p>11 Q Okay. When did HCMFA reach the conclusion</p> <p>12 that Highland was the cause of the NAV error?</p> <p>13 A The -- there was never -- I don't think</p> <p>14 there was ever a question. It was always known</p> <p>15 that HCMLP employees were the ones creating the</p> <p>16 valuation, overseeing the valuation, working with</p> <p>17 the value -- you know, everything that was done</p> <p>18 was outsourced to HCMLP.</p> <p>19 And so it was discussed with the</p> <p>20 board. It was discussed in-depth internally. The</p> <p>21 employees were all HCMLP employees. So I can't</p> <p>22 pinpoint a date, but there -- it was a known</p> <p>23 factor that HCMLP was responsible.</p> <p>24 MR. MORRIS: Okay. I move to</p> <p>25 strike.</p>
<p>Page 136</p> <p>1 Dustin Norris</p> <p>2 BY MR. MORRIS:</p> <p>3 Q The only thing I'm asking you for is a</p> <p>4 date. And if you don't know, the answer is "I</p> <p>5 don't know." So let me try one more time.</p> <p>6 Do you know when HCMFA first</p> <p>7 determined that Highland was negligent?</p> <p>8 A I don't know the first date.</p> <p>9 Q Do you know if it was in 2018 or 2019?</p> <p>10 A I don't know.</p> <p>11 Q Do you know when the NAV error first --</p> <p>12 was first identified?</p> <p>13 A I believe the NAV error was determined in</p> <p>14 early 2019.</p> <p>15 Q Was it before or after -- I mean, the --</p> <p>16 the NAV error must have been identified before</p> <p>17 February 15, 2019; correct?</p> <p>18 A Correct.</p> <p>19 Q Okay.</p> <p>20 A Well, I should say whether there -- I</p> <p>21 don't know. I don't remember -- we'll have to</p> <p>22 look through the documents -- what the actual --</p> <p>23 oh, you're saying before February 15th. Yes,</p> <p>24 that's when the paid insurance proceeds came in.</p> <p>25 So yes.</p>	<p>Page 137</p> <p>1 Dustin Norris</p> <p>2 Q No question -- no question that HCMFA knew</p> <p>3 before February 15, 2019, that there was a NAV</p> <p>4 error; correct?</p> <p>5 A Correct.</p> <p>6 Q No question that HCMFA knew before</p> <p>7 February 15, 2019, that the NAV error was caused</p> <p>8 by Highland; correct?</p> <p>9 A Yeah. Like I said, it was always known</p> <p>10 that these were Highland employees that were</p> <p>11 outsourced through the valuation, and they were</p> <p>12 the ones at fault.</p> <p>13 Q Okay. Do you know if -- if HCMFA ever</p> <p>14 demanded compensation from Highland for any errors</p> <p>15 or mistakes it may have made in connection with</p> <p>16 the TerreStar valuation?</p> <p>17 A Yeah. Mr. Dondero told Frank to make the</p> <p>18 payments to compensate for the NAV error.</p> <p>19 Q And did he do that in his capacity as the</p> <p>20 person in control of HCMFA, or did he do that in</p> <p>21 his capacity as the person in control of Highland?</p> <p>22 A I would imagine it would have been both.</p> <p>23 Further supported, he transferred money -- of his</p> <p>24 own money to HCMLP to then pay HCMFA. And so</p> <p>25 he -- yes, he was on both sides of it, but he had</p>

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 138</p> <p>1 Dustin Norris</p> <p>2 the authority on both sides to make that decision.</p> <p>3 Q Okay. And so Mr. Dondero reached an</p> <p>4 agreement with himself pursuant to which HCMFA</p> <p>5 demanded and Highland agreed to pay the</p> <p>6 \$7.4 million as a consequence of Highland's</p> <p>7 negligent conduct in the performance of its</p> <p>8 valuation services. Do I have that right?</p> <p>9 A Sounds like there's a legal determination</p> <p>10 there that needs to be made. I --</p> <p>11 Q It's a factual one, I promise.</p> <p>12 A Entering -- whether entering into an</p> <p>13 agreement or not, I -- that seems like a legal</p> <p>14 determination. But maybe ask the question again.</p> <p>15 Q Did somebody on behalf of Highland agree</p> <p>16 to pay HCMFA \$7.4 million in order to compensate</p> <p>17 HCMFA for Highland's negligent services in</p> <p>18 connection with the TerreStar valuation?</p> <p>19 A Yes. Mr. Dondero.</p> <p>20 Q Thank you.</p> <p>21 Is there any document anywhere that</p> <p>22 you have ever seen that reflects Highland's</p> <p>23 agreement to pay \$7.4 million as compensation to</p> <p>24 HCMFA?</p> <p>25 A I haven't seen a settlement agreement or</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 139</p> <p>1 Dustin Norris</p> <p>2 an agreement to that effect, no.</p> <p>3 Q You haven't seen anything; correct?</p> <p>4 A No.</p> <p>5 Q Have you looked?</p> <p>6 A We have. I actually wouldn't be</p> <p>7 surprised -- I would be surprised to see one. And</p> <p>8 it's -- my understanding is -- and the company's</p> <p>9 position is that there doesn't need to be an</p> <p>10 agreement. Right? We --</p> <p>11 Q I'm not asking -- I'm going to interrupt</p> <p>12 you again. I'm not asking you --</p> <p>13 MR. RUKAVINA: Well, John --</p> <p>14 MR. MORRIS: -- anything like that.</p> <p>15 I need him to answer my questions or we're</p> <p>16 going to be here all night.</p> <p>17 MR. RUKAVINA: John, hold on.</p> <p>18 BY MR. MORRIS:</p> <p>19 Q Have you ever -- have you ever seen</p> <p>20 anything --</p> <p>21 MR. RUKAVINA: John, hold on. Hold</p> <p>22 on.</p> <p>23 MR. MORRIS: No, no. Davor,</p> <p>24 please -- please --</p> <p>25 MR. RUKAVINA: John, it is not our</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 140</p> <p>1 Dustin Norris</p> <p>2 position -- it is not -- it is our</p> <p>3 position that there is no settlement</p> <p>4 agreement.</p> <p>5 MR. MORRIS: Thank you very much.</p> <p>6 BY MR. MORRIS:</p> <p>7 Q Is it your position that there is any</p> <p>8 document of any kind that reflects Highland's</p> <p>9 agreement to pay \$7.4 million as compensation?</p> <p>10 A No. Subject to our defenses, but there's</p> <p>11 none.</p> <p>12 Q Did Mr. Dondero tell Mr. Waterhouse that</p> <p>13 the money that he was asking to be transferred</p> <p>14 from Highland to HCMFA be transferred as</p> <p>15 compensation for the NAV error?</p> <p>16 A Our position is that this was compensation</p> <p>17 for the NAV error, and that was discussed.</p> <p>18 Mr. Dondero told Frank. And I believe Frank even</p> <p>19 testified to that, and Mr. Dondero testified to</p> <p>20 that in their depositions.</p> <p>21 Q Okay. Now, you said that the February</p> <p>22 payment of over \$5 million was funded through</p> <p>23 insurance proceeds and cash.</p> <p>24 Do I have that right?</p> <p>25 A Yes.</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 141</p> <p>1 Dustin Norris</p> <p>2 Q And the cash portion was really just the</p> <p>3 deductible?</p> <p>4 A If you want to go to Page 2, we can look</p> <p>5 at the details.</p> <p>6 Q Sure. Sure.</p> <p>7 A I don't have it all by memory.</p> <p>8 Q That's fair.</p> <p>9 MR. MORRIS: Let's go to the next</p> <p>10 page.</p> <p>11 BY MR. MORRIS:</p> <p>12 Q Looking at this, do the third and fourth</p> <p>13 lines refresh your recollection --</p> <p>14 A Yes.</p> <p>15 Q -- that the February payment was funded</p> <p>16 through insurance proceeds and an insurance</p> <p>17 deductible paid by the adviser?</p> <p>18 A Yes, I believe that's correct.</p> <p>19 Q Okay. And Topic Number 8 on the 30(b)(6)</p> <p>20 notice relates to the insurance claim; right?</p> <p>21 A Uh-huh.</p> <p>22 Q Okay. Did you do anything to familiarize</p> <p>23 yourself with the insurance claim?</p> <p>24 A I did.</p> <p>25 Q And what did you do to familiarize</p>

<p>Page 142</p> <p>1 Dustin Norris</p> <p>2 yourself with the insurance claim?</p> <p>3 A I discussed with DC and Davor the</p> <p>4 company's position on the insurance claim.</p> <p>5 Q Okay. I don't want to know what the</p> <p>6 company's position is. I want to know what the</p> <p>7 facts are.</p> <p>8 Did you learn any facts in connection</p> <p>9 with your diligence and your preparation to answer</p> <p>10 topic -- questions on Topic Number 8?</p> <p>11 A Yeah. The HCMFA policy was -- was -- the</p> <p>12 HCMFA -- HCMFA had an insurance policy with ICI</p> <p>13 Mutual; and based on the NAV error, the policy</p> <p>14 was -- I don't know what the word is -- was used</p> <p>15 to seek reimbursement for the NAV error.</p> <p>16 Q Okay. So --</p> <p>17 (Reporter discussion off the record.)</p> <p>18 BY MR. MORRIS:</p> <p>19 Q So did HCMFA file a claim for insurance</p> <p>20 coverage with ICI Mutual in connection with the</p> <p>21 NAV error?</p> <p>22 A The HCMLP employees, I believe, through</p> <p>23 Frank Waterhouse and his team, did that. They --</p> <p>24 they managed the insurance as part of the shared</p> <p>25 services agreement, and they filed with the</p>	<p>Page 143</p> <p>1 Dustin Norris</p> <p>2 insurance company --</p> <p>3 Q And -- and the filing --</p> <p>4 A -- on behalf of HCMFA.</p> <p>5 Q And the filing that was made, was that a</p> <p>6 claim that was made on behalf of HCMFA?</p> <p>7 A I believe so, yes.</p> <p>8 Q And did HCMFA authorize the filing of that</p> <p>9 claim?</p> <p>10 A Our position is that that -- that is a</p> <p>11 valid claim from HCMFA.</p> <p>12 Q All right. Did HCMFA authorize the filing</p> <p>13 of the insurance claim?</p> <p>14 A I -- I don't know.</p> <p>15 Q Did -- has HCMFA ever told anybody at any</p> <p>16 time that the insurance claim was not authorized</p> <p>17 by HCMFA?</p> <p>18 A No.</p> <p>19 Q And HCMFA received almost \$5 million on</p> <p>20 account of the claim; right?</p> <p>21 A Correct.</p> <p>22 Q And HCMFA wanted to recover on its</p> <p>23 insurance claim; correct?</p> <p>24 A Yes.</p> <p>25 Q Did the claim -- was the claim made in</p>
<p>Page 144</p> <p>1 Dustin Norris</p> <p>2 writing?</p> <p>3 A I believe so.</p> <p>4 Q Have you seen the claim?</p> <p>5 A I don't -- I don't recall seeing the</p> <p>6 claim.</p> <p>7 Q In connection with the defense of this</p> <p>8 lawsuit and the preparation, have you made any</p> <p>9 efforts to identify the actual claim that was</p> <p>10 filed on behalf of HCMFA?</p> <p>11 MR. RUKAVINA: Let me interject --</p> <p>12 let -- let me interject. And we can talk</p> <p>13 about this offline. We searched for that</p> <p>14 and could not find it. We suspect it</p> <p>15 might be in HCMLP's legal documents that</p> <p>16 we don't have access to, but we have and</p> <p>17 we continue to actively search for the</p> <p>18 claim itself. We have not been able to</p> <p>19 find it.</p> <p>20 BY MR. MORRIS:</p> <p>21 Q Does HCMFA use an insurance broker?</p> <p>22 A I don't believe so for this. I think it's</p> <p>23 directly with ICI Mutual. And it -- we -- there's</p> <p>24 no broker, but it goes through HCMLP's employees.</p> <p>25 Frank Waterhouse would have been the one probably</p>	<p>Page 145</p> <p>1 Dustin Norris</p> <p>2 interacting with ICI Mutual.</p> <p>3 Q HCMFA and HCMLP broke up at the end of</p> <p>4 February; is that fair?</p> <p>5 A That's correct.</p> <p>6 Q At any time since the end of February, has</p> <p>7 HCMFA made any effort to obtain any information</p> <p>8 concerning this insurance claim from ICI Mutual?</p> <p>9 A I don't know where we got the source of --</p> <p>10 of the documents, but there -- there was -- they</p> <p>11 were searching for the ICI documents. I don't</p> <p>12 know if it came from ICI or another source.</p> <p>13 Q Anybody --</p> <p>14 A I don't --</p> <p>15 Q Anybody from HCMFA reach out to ICI Mutual</p> <p>16 for information relating to this insurance claim</p> <p>17 at any time?</p> <p>18 A I don't -- not that I'm aware of.</p> <p>19 Q Okay.</p> <p>20 A They may have, but I don't know.</p> <p>21 Q Do you know when the claim was filed?</p> <p>22 A I don't. I -- I don't. I -- I think it</p> <p>23 may have been late 2018, but I'm not sure.</p> <p>24 Q And at the time HCMFA filed the claim for</p> <p>25 insurance, it had already formed the opinion that</p>

<p>Page 146</p> <p>1 Dustin Norris</p> <p>2 Highland Capital Management, LP, was the</p> <p>3 responsible party; correct?</p> <p>4 A I believe so, yes.</p> <p>5 Q Did HCMFA tell the insurance company that</p> <p>6 Highland Capital Management was the responsible</p> <p>7 party?</p> <p>8 A I'm not sure. Again, this was Highland</p> <p>9 employees that filled out the materials and was</p> <p>10 working with ICI. So I don't know if your</p> <p>11 employees notified them.</p> <p>12 Q So the total estimated loss was</p> <p>13 approximately \$7.5 million; right? That's the top</p> <p>14 number on the right?</p> <p>15 A Yes.</p> <p>16 Q Okay. And roughly two-thirds of that was</p> <p>17 financed through insurance proceeds that were</p> <p>18 received in February of 2019; correct?</p> <p>19 A Correct.</p> <p>20 Q And thereafter, it's HCMFA's contention</p> <p>21 that Highland paid it another \$7.4 million for</p> <p>22 purposes of providing compensation in connection</p> <p>23 with its negligent work on the -- on the TerreStar</p> <p>24 valuation error; correct?</p> <p>25 A Yes, that's correct. And that lines up,</p>	<p>Page 147</p> <p>1 Dustin Norris</p> <p>2 7.4 million, with the net -- net loss that's shown</p> <p>3 there, estimated loss.</p> <p>4 Q Right. So it's fair to say, then, from --</p> <p>5 that it's HCMFA's position that it received</p> <p>6 \$7.4 million from Highland as compensation, and</p> <p>7 approximately \$5 million from the insurance</p> <p>8 carrier as compensation for total receipts of</p> <p>9 \$12.4 million in connection with the NAV star --</p> <p>10 with the TerreStar valuation error?</p> <p>11 A Correct.</p> <p>12 Q Okay. Why would H -- why does HCMFA</p> <p>13 contend that its entitled to \$12.4 million from</p> <p>14 Highland and the insurance company when the total</p> <p>15 loss was only \$7.4 million?</p> <p>16 A Yeah, it's -- it's our position that the</p> <p>17 collateral -- and I'm not an attorney. But</p> <p>18 understanding our position here, that under Texas</p> <p>19 law, the collateral source rule would permit you</p> <p>20 to recover value from the insurance company and to</p> <p>21 the individual or the -- the company that created</p> <p>22 the -- or caused you harm.</p> <p>23 Q So you're -- would you agree that HCMFA</p> <p>24 has profited by about \$5 million as a result of</p> <p>25 the NAV error under that theory?</p>
<p>Page 148</p> <p>1 Dustin Norris</p> <p>2 A I -- I don't know that -- how the theory</p> <p>3 relates to profits, but we've -- we've paid -- and</p> <p>4 say, "What's the logic for this?" We paid in</p> <p>5 insurance premiums for years, significant</p> <p>6 insurance premiums. And so there's been a loss</p> <p>7 for years and years for the insurance, and then</p> <p>8 we're now hitting that insurance to say there's a</p> <p>9 gain of \$5 million, whatever number you threw out.</p> <p>10 I would disagree with that.</p> <p>11 But, yes, there was proceeds of</p> <p>12 12-and-a-half million, but we've been paying in</p> <p>13 insurance proceeds or premiums for a long time.</p> <p>14 We're going to continue, and likely, I would</p> <p>15 imagine, those premiums will go up because of the</p> <p>16 claim.</p> <p>17 So I -- I'm, again, not a lawyer. I</p> <p>18 don't understand all the reasons why it's</p> <p>19 permitted. But our position is that the</p> <p>20 collateral source rule under Texas law permits you</p> <p>21 to receive from the insurance -- your insurance</p> <p>22 provider and from the party that did you harm.</p> <p>23 And as you said, here we believe it's negligence.</p> <p>24 It may be breach of contract, but we believe it's</p> <p>25 negligence.</p>	<p>Page 149</p> <p>1 Dustin Norris</p> <p>2 Q Okay. I just want to make this really</p> <p>3 clean.</p> <p>4 The estimated net loss from the NAV</p> <p>5 error is \$7.442 million; correct?</p> <p>6 A The estimated loss from the NAV error,</p> <p>7 yes.</p> <p>8 Q Okay. And notwithstanding that HCMFA</p> <p>9 believed that Highland was the responsible party,</p> <p>10 HCMFA, nevertheless, filed a claim for insurance</p> <p>11 coverage with ICI Mutual; correct?</p> <p>12 A That's correct.</p> <p>13 Q And ICI Mutual paid almost \$5 million in</p> <p>14 connection with that claim; correct?</p> <p>15 A Correct.</p> <p>16 Q And in addition to that almost \$5 million,</p> <p>17 it's HCMFA's position that it received and was</p> <p>18 entitled to receive an additional \$7.4 million</p> <p>19 from Highland as compensation for its error;</p> <p>20 correct?</p> <p>21 A Correct.</p> <p>22 Q So that notwithstanding the fact that the</p> <p>23 estimated net loss was \$7.44 million, HCMFA</p> <p>24 received and contends that it's entitled to keep</p> <p>25 \$12.4 million; correct?</p>

<p>Page 150</p> <p>1 Dustin Norris</p> <p>2 A That's correct, subject to our defenses.</p> <p>3 Q Okay. Did -- has -- has HCMFA ever</p> <p>4 informed ICI Mutual that it received \$7.4 million</p> <p>5 from Highland on account of the NAV error?</p> <p>6 A Not that I'm aware of.</p> <p>7 Q Has HCMFA ever told ICI Mutual that</p> <p>8 Highland was at fault?</p> <p>9 A Again, I think I already answered that. I</p> <p>10 don't know. Communication with ICI was done by</p> <p>11 the HCMLP employees as part of the shared services</p> <p>12 agreement, and I'm not sure if they communicated</p> <p>13 that.</p> <p>14 MR. MORRIS: Okay. I move to</p> <p>15 strike.</p> <p>16 BY MR. MORRIS:</p> <p>17 Q I just -- I'm just asking for your</p> <p>18 knowledge, not speculation.</p> <p>19 Do you have any knowledge that anyone</p> <p>20 on behalf of HCMFA ever informed ICI Mutual that</p> <p>21 Highland was the cause of the NAV error?</p> <p>22 A I have no knowledge.</p> <p>23 MR. MORRIS: Let's take a short</p> <p>24 break. The time now is 3:06 -- or 2:06.</p> <p>25 Let's just come back at 3:20.</p>	<p>Page 151</p> <p>1 Dustin Norris</p> <p>2 (Recess from 2:07 p.m. to 2:21 p.m. CST)</p> <p>3 BY MR. MORRIS:</p> <p>4 Q So we were talking a bit about the</p> <p>5 insurance payment that was received in February</p> <p>6 of 2019. Do you remember that?</p> <p>7 A Yes.</p> <p>8 Q And there was a claim that was filed on</p> <p>9 behalf of HCMFA that resulted in that insurance</p> <p>10 proceed payment; correct?</p> <p>11 A Correct.</p> <p>12 Q And do you recall if that insurance claim</p> <p>13 was filed in 2018 or 2019?</p> <p>14 A I don't recall, but I believe it was late</p> <p>15 2018. But I don't know.</p> <p>16 Q Yeah.</p> <p>17 A And as we testified, we don't have that</p> <p>18 claim. We've searched for it. It's probably on</p> <p>19 your server, as I -- Frank Waterhouse and his team</p> <p>20 would have submitted that.</p> <p>21 Q Yeah. But you haven't made any effort to</p> <p>22 get it from the carrier; right?</p> <p>23 A No, not that I know of.</p> <p>24 Q Okay. And would you agree with me that</p> <p>25 it's probably extremely unlikely that an insurance</p>
<p>Page 152</p> <p>1 Dustin Norris</p> <p>2 carrier would have processed a claim of that</p> <p>3 magnitude in six weeks?</p> <p>4 A I know they expedited it and they</p> <p>5 specialize in -- sorry. I'll step back.</p> <p>6 I have no knowledge of how quick</p> <p>7 carriers make these claims --</p> <p>8 Q All right. Do you know --</p> <p>9 A Other than hail on my house -- hail damage</p> <p>10 on my roof, I don't have personal knowledge of</p> <p>11 insurance claims.</p> <p>12 MR. MORRIS: You know, I apologize,</p> <p>13 but can I ask Ms. Canty to put back up on</p> <p>14 the screen that last exhibit that we had?</p> <p>15 I don't have the exhibit number.</p> <p>16 All right. And go to the prior</p> <p>17 page. And go to the bottom of that page.</p> <p>18 BY MR. MORRIS:</p> <p>19 Q So we've put back up on the screen, I</p> <p>20 think --</p> <p>21 MS. CANTY: 182.</p> <p>22 MR. MORRIS: 182.</p> <p>23 BY MR. MORRIS:</p> <p>24 Q All right. And do you see in the next to</p> <p>25 the last paragraph, Mr. Norris, there's a</p>	<p>Page 153</p> <p>1 Dustin Norris</p> <p>2 reference to a period from March 18, 2018, to</p> <p>3 January 19, 2019?</p> <p>4 A Yes.</p> <p>5 Q That's what they've defined as the NAV</p> <p>6 restatement period. Do you see that?</p> <p>7 A Yes, I do.</p> <p>8 Q Okay. Looking at that period, does that</p> <p>9 refresh your recollection at all as to when in</p> <p>10 2018 HCMFA first learned about the NAV error?</p> <p>11 A No, because that was -- that was the</p> <p>12 period of time when the market -- the off-market</p> <p>13 or on-market transactions happened, March 18th.</p> <p>14 Q Okay.</p> <p>15 A It was sometime in between that they found</p> <p>16 out that there was an error.</p> <p>17 Q Okay. And do you know if it was the first</p> <p>18 half of 2018 or the second half?</p> <p>19 A The midyear audits of some of our funds, I</p> <p>20 believe, is when it first came up.</p> <p>21 Q And --</p> <p>22 A So 6/30 audits that were due 60 days</p> <p>23 later. So second half -- I believe second half of</p> <p>24 2018.</p> <p>25 Q So is it fair to say sometime in August or</p>

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 154</p> <p>1 Dustin Norris</p> <p>2 September is when HCMFA first learned about it?</p> <p>3 A About -- define "it." Is that the NAV</p> <p>4 error.</p> <p>5 Q I apologize. Let me ask the question</p> <p>6 again.</p> <p>7 Is it fair to say, based on the timing</p> <p>8 of the audit, 60 days after June 30th would take</p> <p>9 us to approximately August 31st; right?</p> <p>10 A It does.</p> <p>11 Q And so is it fair to say, then, that HCMFA</p> <p>12 first learned about the NAV error sometime in</p> <p>13 August of 2018 while it was preparing the</p> <p>14 financials for the period ending June 30th?</p> <p>15 A No. I don't think there was a</p> <p>16 determination of whether there was a NAV error or</p> <p>17 not at that point. I think the reason they have</p> <p>18 going all the way to January 19 -- 2019 is it</p> <p>19 wasn't determined -- finalized if there is an</p> <p>20 error or not.</p> <p>21 There was a lot of discussion with the</p> <p>22 SEC and auditors over whether there was or wasn't</p> <p>23 an error, what the amount was, what the proper</p> <p>24 valuation should be. There was consultation with</p> <p>25 the SEC, and that process lasted, I believe,</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 155</p> <p>1 Dustin Norris</p> <p>2 several weeks, if not months.</p> <p>3 So that is not when they found out</p> <p>4 about a NAV error, but the questions over</p> <p>5 valuation, yes.</p> <p>6 Q Okay. So then let me state the question</p> <p>7 differently then.</p> <p>8 Is it fair to say that HCMFA first</p> <p>9 learned in or about August 2018 of the valuation</p> <p>10 issues?</p> <p>11 A The "about" is key here. I don't know the</p> <p>12 specific date, but around that time or earlier --</p> <p>13 Q Okay.</p> <p>14 A -- or later. On or around that time.</p> <p>15 Q And did HCMFA conclude, at the same time</p> <p>16 it learned of the valuation issues, that HCMFA was</p> <p>17 the responsible party? Or was there a gap between</p> <p>18 learning about the valuation issues and making the</p> <p>19 determination that Highland was the responsible</p> <p>20 party?</p> <p>21 A Yeah, first you said HCMFA was the</p> <p>22 responsible party, and then you said Highland.</p> <p>23 Q I apologize. Let me try and restate that.</p> <p>24 Did HCMFA conclude that Highland was</p> <p>25 the responsible party at or around the same time</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 156</p> <p>1 Dustin Norris</p> <p>2 that it learned of the valuation issues, or was</p> <p>3 there a period during which it knew about the</p> <p>4 valuation issues, but not -- had not yet formed</p> <p>5 the conclusion that Highland was the responsible</p> <p>6 party?</p> <p>7 A From the beginning, everybody knew who the</p> <p>8 responsible party was for the valuation. Those</p> <p>9 reporting the issues, those responding to</p> <p>10 auditors, those responding to SEC and the board</p> <p>11 were all HCMLP employees from the beginning. But</p> <p>12 I don't have a specific date.</p> <p>13 Again, as you look here, it doesn't</p> <p>14 say when the NAV error was determined, but from</p> <p>15 the beginning, it was the knowledge that HCMLP was</p> <p>16 responsible for the valuations.</p> <p>17 Q Okay. Do you know when HCMFA first</p> <p>18 determined that the estimated loss was</p> <p>19 approximately \$7.4 million?</p> <p>20 A I don't, no. I don't have specifics, but</p> <p>21 it was after there was a determination there was</p> <p>22 actually a NAV error. And it may be in some of</p> <p>23 the documents that you have. I believe it may be</p> <p>24 in, you know, a memo to the board or the SEC, but</p> <p>25 I don't know offhand.</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 157</p> <p>1 Dustin Norris</p> <p>2 Q Do you know when there was a determination</p> <p>3 that there was a NAV error?</p> <p>4 A I don't know the specific time, no.</p> <p>5 Q Do you know if it was in 2019 or 2018?</p> <p>6 A I don't remember.</p> <p>7 Q Is it fair to say that it was before</p> <p>8 May of 2019?</p> <p>9 A That there was a determination there was a</p> <p>10 NAV error? Yes.</p> <p>11 Q And is it fair to say that HCMFA had</p> <p>12 concluded that the loss of that NAV error was</p> <p>13 going to be more than a million dollars prior to</p> <p>14 May 2019?</p> <p>15 A More than a million? Probably -- yes.</p> <p>16 Q Okay. Is there a reason that HCMFA waited</p> <p>17 until May to have Highland pay it for the</p> <p>18 compensation?</p> <p>19 A I think that the whole process -- as you</p> <p>20 see, the resolution memo is in May to the board.</p> <p>21 That was the conclusion of the overall process.</p> <p>22 So our stance would be that that was when it was</p> <p>23 the right time and everything was -- the right</p> <p>24 time to be sent.</p> <p>25 MR. MORRIS: Okay. Can we put up</p>

<p>Page 158</p> <p>1 Dustin Norris</p> <p>2 on the screen a document that's been</p> <p>3 marked as, I think, as Exhibit 13? I</p> <p>4 don't know if you're able to get that,</p> <p>5 La Asia.</p> <p>6 MS. CANTY: Yup, I got it.</p> <p>7 MR. MORRIS: Thank you.</p> <p>8 (Exhibit 13 tendered.)</p> <p>9 BY MR. MORRIS:</p> <p>10 Q Are you aware, sir, that there came a</p> <p>11 point in time when HCMFA amended its answer?</p> <p>12 A Yes.</p> <p>13 Q And I think topic --</p> <p>14 A Topic 2 is our amended answer.</p> <p>15 Q Okay. So that's the document that's in</p> <p>16 front of you?</p> <p>17 A Yes.</p> <p>18 Q And you've seen that before; correct?</p> <p>19 A Yes.</p> <p>20 Q Okay.</p> <p>21 MR. MORRIS: Can we turn to Page 5</p> <p>22 of 9, please?</p> <p>23 And if we can scroll to the bottom.</p> <p>24 BY MR. MORRIS:</p> <p>25 Q These are HCMFA's affirmative defenses; is</p>	<p>Page 159</p> <p>1 Dustin Norris</p> <p>2 that right?</p> <p>3 A On the second amended answer, yes.</p> <p>4 Q Yes.</p> <p>5 A I'm sorry. The first amended answer, yes.</p> <p>6 Q And as of today, is it your understanding</p> <p>7 that this is HCMFA's operative pleading?</p> <p>8 A No.</p> <p>9 Q Has it been amended after this time?</p> <p>10 A Yeah, we --</p> <p>11 MR. RUKAVINA: Well, he doesn't</p> <p>12 know what "operative pleading" means.</p> <p>13 THE WITNESS: Oh.</p> <p>14 MR. RUKAVINA: Yes, it is our</p> <p>15 operative pleading, Dustin.</p> <p>16 THE WITNESS: It is our operative</p> <p>17 pleading then.</p> <p>18 BY MR. MORRIS:</p> <p>19 Q And I didn't mean to trick you. I</p> <p>20 apologize. I just meant to say that this has not</p> <p>21 been amended as of today; correct?</p> <p>22 A We filed a -- wait. Let me see what it's</p> <p>23 called.</p> <p>24 Q You filed a motion for permission to amend</p> <p>25 it further --</p>
<p>Page 160</p> <p>1 Dustin Norris</p> <p>2 A Yes.</p> <p>3 Q -- but that motion hasn't been granted;</p> <p>4 right?</p> <p>5 A To my understanding, no.</p> <p>6 Q Okay. And you understand that your -- the</p> <p>7 answer that's up on the screen can't be amended</p> <p>8 unless the Court grants the motion; right?</p> <p>9 A I -- if you tell me that that's the</p> <p>10 process, I'll take that for what it's worth. I'm</p> <p>11 not an attorney. I don't know the process.</p> <p>12 Q Okay. So let's just look at this</p> <p>13 document.</p> <p>14 Is it fair to say that Paragraph 38</p> <p>15 through 45 deals with --</p> <p>16 A I'm going to grab the --</p> <p>17 Q Yeah.</p> <p>18 A -- thing here so I can see it on my desk,</p> <p>19 too.</p> <p>20 Q Sure.</p> <p>21 A Okay.</p> <p>22 38?</p> <p>23 Q Right.</p> <p>24 A Okay.</p> <p>25 Q Now -- actually, a little background.</p>	<p>Page 161</p> <p>1 Dustin Norris</p> <p>2 This amended complaint was prepared</p> <p>3 after DC Sauter conducted an investigation</p> <p>4 concerning the circumstances surrounding the two</p> <p>5 notes that Highland was suing on; right?</p> <p>6 A Yes. My understanding is it is after</p> <p>7 he -- so background, when he -- we filed our</p> <p>8 initial response, we didn't have access to the</p> <p>9 HCMLP employees during that time period. They</p> <p>10 were not permitted to talk to us about things like</p> <p>11 this. And so he did the best he could to prepare</p> <p>12 a response. But once they were mostly all fired</p> <p>13 by HCMLP and formed their own company called</p> <p>14 Skyview, he was able to talk to them on</p> <p>15 particulars. As you note in his -- his statement,</p> <p>16 he was able to talk to Frank Waterhouse, where he</p> <p>17 wasn't before, on this topic.</p> <p>18 Q Right. So by the time this document has</p> <p>19 been prepared, HCMFA had copies of the notes that</p> <p>20 Highland was suing on for six months; right?</p> <p>21 Because the lawsuit was commenced in January, and</p> <p>22 the notes were attached as exhibits to the</p> <p>23 complaint; right?</p> <p>24 A Yes. This is July 6th this is filed.</p> <p>25 Q Right. Okay. So this is filed almost six</p>

<p>Page 162</p> <p>1 Dustin Norris</p> <p>2 months after the complaint is filed; right?</p> <p>3 A More like a five-month -- five months and</p> <p>4 a week, but yeah.</p> <p>5 Q All right. I won't quarrel with you.</p> <p>6 A Or five and a half -- five and a half</p> <p>7 months, yeah.</p> <p>8 Q Okay.</p> <p>9 A Whether you consider that --</p> <p>10 Q Okay.</p> <p>11 A -- six full months or not.</p> <p>12 Q So --</p> <p>13 A We know the dates January 22nd and</p> <p>14 July 6th.</p> <p>15 Q Okay. So for that entire time period of</p> <p>16 time, there's no dispute that HCMFA had in its</p> <p>17 possession copies of the notes that Highland was</p> <p>18 suing on; correct?</p> <p>19 A I'm looking at the original -- you said</p> <p>20 they were attached, but I --</p> <p>21 Q Yeah.</p> <p>22 A If you want to show me the original notes</p> <p>23 on the original filing.</p> <p>24 Q Well, I asked you to look at the original</p> <p>25 complaint. I think -- was the original complaint</p>	<p>Page 163</p> <p>1 Dustin Norris</p> <p>2 Topic Number 1? No. It's just the answer.</p> <p>3 In looking at the answer, did you look</p> <p>4 at the original complaint?</p> <p>5 A Yes.</p> <p>6 Q Do you recall seeing that the notes were</p> <p>7 attached to the original complaint?</p> <p>8 A I looked at thousands of pages in</p> <p>9 preparation, so I just -- I could take your word</p> <p>10 for it if you say it's in there, or if you want to</p> <p>11 show it to me, we can look at it.</p> <p>12 MR. RUKAVINA: They are, Dustin.</p> <p>13 They are.</p> <p>14 MR. MORRIS: Yeah. I think you'll</p> <p>15 have to take my word for it. Thank you,</p> <p>16 Davor, for confirming my word.</p> <p>17 BY MR. MORRIS:</p> <p>18 Q So let me just try this again to make it</p> <p>19 clean.</p> <p>20 Based on my representation, that</p> <p>21 Mr. Rukavina has agreed with, that the notes that</p> <p>22 Highland are suing on were attached to its</p> <p>23 complaint in January, you would agree with me that</p> <p>24 HCMFA had the notes in its possession from at</p> <p>25 least the time the complaint was filed until the</p>
<p>Page 164</p> <p>1 Dustin Norris</p> <p>2 time HCMFA filed this amended answer on July 6th;</p> <p>3 correct?</p> <p>4 A Yes.</p> <p>5 Q And this amended answer was filed because</p> <p>6 HCMFA had a -- had previously made a motion to the</p> <p>7 Court for leave to amend its answer; correct?</p> <p>8 MR. RUKAVINA: That's correct,</p> <p>9 Dustin.</p> <p>10 He wouldn't know about that, but</p> <p>11 that's all correct.</p> <p>12 BY MR. MORRIS:</p> <p>13 Q Okay. Well, you're familiar with the</p> <p>14 Sauter declaration; right?</p> <p>15 A I am.</p> <p>16 Q And the Sauter declaration purports to</p> <p>17 describe an investigation that Mr. Sauter</p> <p>18 undertook to determine the circumstances</p> <p>19 surrounding the notes; is that fair?</p> <p>20 A I don't know if I'd characterize it</p> <p>21 investigation, but he was tasked with -- and I've</p> <p>22 got it right here. I would refer you to the</p> <p>23 agreement on -- or his -- to his declaration on --</p> <p>24 Q How would you -- how would you</p> <p>25 characterize the work that he did? An</p>	<p>Page 165</p> <p>1 Dustin Norris</p> <p>2 investigation? An analysis? What word do</p> <p>3 you -- would you use? Due diligence? How would</p> <p>4 you characterize the work that Mr. Sauter did</p> <p>5 that's set forth in his declaration?</p> <p>6 A I -- I'm looking here. I want to see how</p> <p>7 he characterizes it.</p> <p>8 I think he does a very good job of</p> <p>9 explaining.</p> <p>10 My investigation would be of the</p> <p>11 following. So he calls it an investigation.</p> <p>12 Q Okay. So HCMFA would agree that after</p> <p>13 Mr. Waterhouse left the employ of Highland, that</p> <p>14 DC Sauter conducted an investigation into the</p> <p>15 circumstances surrounding the notes that Highland</p> <p>16 was suing on; correct?</p> <p>17 A Correct.</p> <p>18 Q And as part of that investigation, he</p> <p>19 spoke with Mr. Waterhouse; correct?</p> <p>20 A Yes.</p> <p>21 Q And as part of that investigation, he</p> <p>22 spoke with Mr. Dondero; correct?</p> <p>23 A I believe so, but let me -- let me confirm</p> <p>24 in his statement.</p> <p>25 Because I believe in -- yeah.</p>

<p>Page 166</p> <p>1 Dustin Norris</p> <p>2 Q Is that correct, that he spoke with</p> <p>3 Mr. Dondero in connection with his investigation?</p> <p>4 A I'm -- I'm seeing what he rep'd to in his</p> <p>5 statement.</p> <p>6 Q And does his statement say that? I don't</p> <p>7 have it in front of me.</p> <p>8 A I don't know. That's what I'm looking at.</p> <p>9 Q And you don't know, independently of the</p> <p>10 document, whether Mr. Sauter spoke with</p> <p>11 Mr. Dondero as part of his investigation?</p> <p>12 A I know he did. I know he talked</p> <p>13 throughout from when we received the original</p> <p>14 complaint on. I just -- you're asking about the</p> <p>15 time frame between filing the original filing.</p> <p>16 And I think he may have spoken with him before</p> <p>17 that, too, but I -- I just want to take a...</p> <p>18 So at the time -- this is on</p> <p>19 March 1st, filed the defendant's original answer.</p> <p>20 At that -- at the time the debtor filed a</p> <p>21 complaint, I promptly undertook an internal review</p> <p>22 of the background facts concerning the notes. I</p> <p>23 had no knowledge of them since I had not been</p> <p>24 employed by HCMFA. And a few employees of HCMFA</p> <p>25 had no knowledge of notes. I also discussed the</p>	<p>Page 167</p> <p>1 Dustin Norris</p> <p>2 notes of James Dondero, formerly the CEO of the</p> <p>3 debtor, Mr. Dondero.</p> <p>4 So this is March 1st when that first</p> <p>5 filing was made. So he did speak with Mr. Dondero</p> <p>6 prior, and then I believe the source of the</p> <p>7 additional information was being able to speak</p> <p>8 with Frank Waterhouse and Will Mabry.</p> <p>9 Q Okay. And is it fair to say that the</p> <p>10 amended complaint is based on Mr. Sauter's</p> <p>11 investigation?</p> <p>12 A Yes, I believe so.</p> <p>13 Q Yeah.</p> <p>14 A Yes.</p> <p>15 Q That's why HCMFA amended its complaint.</p> <p>16 It's because Mr. Sauter had undertaken this</p> <p>17 investigation, and he learned what he believed</p> <p>18 were relevant facts, and those facts are described</p> <p>19 in his declaration, and they formed the basis of</p> <p>20 the affirmative defenses that we're looking at now</p> <p>21 in the amended answer; fair?</p> <p>22 A Let me pull up the amended answer just</p> <p>23 to --</p> <p>24 Q It's up on the screen, but if you have a</p> <p>25 hard copy, that's fine.</p>
<p>Page 168</p> <p>1 Dustin Norris</p> <p>2 A Yeah. I have a hard copy here, although I</p> <p>3 may have mixed my documents.</p> <p>4 Yeah, it was based on additional facts</p> <p>5 that weren't available at the time of the original</p> <p>6 response.</p> <p>7 Q Okay. And is it fair to say that</p> <p>8 Paragraphs 38 through 45 relate to the affirmative</p> <p>9 defense that Highland was responsible for the NAV</p> <p>10 error, and the \$7.4 million payment was intended</p> <p>11 to be compensation for Highland's negligent work?</p> <p>12 A Sorry. Can you ask that one more time?</p> <p>13 There was a couple parts there.</p> <p>14 Q No problem.</p> <p>15 Is it fair to say that</p> <p>16 Paragraphs 35 -- withdrawn.</p> <p>17 Is it fair to say that Paragraphs 38</p> <p>18 to 45 relate to HCMFA's affirmative defense that</p> <p>19 the \$7.4 million that was transferred from</p> <p>20 Highland to HCMFA in May 2019 was intended to be</p> <p>21 compensation for Highland's negligent work in</p> <p>22 connection with the NAV error and not in the form</p> <p>23 of a loan?</p> <p>24 A You said 38 to 42?</p> <p>25 Q 38 to 45.</p>	<p>Page 169</p> <p>1 Dustin Norris</p> <p>2 A 38 to 45.</p> <p>3 Yeah, it -- the NAV error items are</p> <p>4 included in there as one of our defenses.</p> <p>5 Q Right.</p> <p>6 A 43 and 44 and 45 discuss additional</p> <p>7 defenses related to the note and who may or may</p> <p>8 not have signed the note and who had authority to</p> <p>9 sign the note.</p> <p>10 Q Okay.</p> <p>11 MR. MORRIS: Can you -- can we turn</p> <p>12 to Paragraph 42?</p> <p>13 THE WITNESS: Yes.</p> <p>14 BY MR. MORRIS:</p> <p>15 Q Do you see the first four -- first few</p> <p>16 words in Paragraph 42 are, quote: "The defendant</p> <p>17 accepted responsibility for the NAV error"?</p> <p>18 A Yes.</p> <p>19 Q Okay. "Defendant" there refers to</p> <p>20 Highland Capital Management, LP; correct?</p> <p>21 A No. I believe --</p> <p>22 Q Oh, I apologize. I apologize.</p> <p>23 A Thank you.</p> <p>24 Q It's HCMFA; right?</p> <p>25 A HCMFA.</p>

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 170</p> <p>1 Dustin Norris</p> <p>2 Q Okay. And is -- did -- did HCMFA accept</p> <p>3 responsibility for the NAV error?</p> <p>4 A They did. They -- they are the adviser,</p> <p>5 and there's already -- in the next sentence, HCMLP</p> <p>6 then accepted that they had a contract with and</p> <p>7 accepted responsibility.</p> <p>8 Q Okay. And so when did the plaintiff</p> <p>9 accept responsibility for having caused the NAV</p> <p>10 error?</p> <p>11 A Again, going back to -- this was always</p> <p>12 known and communicated that it was HCMLP</p> <p>13 employees. It was the valuation services they</p> <p>14 were performing. The legal and compliance team</p> <p>15 was all outsourced in the shared services</p> <p>16 agreement.</p> <p>17 And that was -- again, there's not a</p> <p>18 singular determination; but Jim Dondero, as</p> <p>19 president, I would say effectuated that with the</p> <p>20 payment of the NAV -- for the NAV error.</p> <p>21 Q So you can't tell me when the plaintiff</p> <p>22 accepted responsibility for having caused the NAV</p> <p>23 error; correct?</p> <p>24 A Not a specific date.</p> <p>25 Q Okay. And it's HCMFA's position that Jim</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 171</p> <p>1 Dustin Norris</p> <p>2 Dondero, in his capacity as the president of</p> <p>3 Highland Capital Management, LP, accepted</p> <p>4 responsibility on behalf of Highland Capital</p> <p>5 Management, LP, for having caused the NAV error?</p> <p>6 A He, and in addition all of the employees</p> <p>7 involved. Right? The valuation team members,</p> <p>8 Frank Waterhouse was CFO, Dave Klos overseeing the</p> <p>9 valuation process, they were all Highland</p> <p>10 employees, and Jim Dondero as well as president</p> <p>11 recognized that based on all the communications</p> <p>12 and conversations they would have had.</p> <p>13 MR. MORRIS: Okay. I'm going to --</p> <p>14 I'm going to move to strike.</p> <p>15 BY MR. MORRIS:</p> <p>16 Q And I'm going to ask you to listen</p> <p>17 carefully to my question.</p> <p>18 Who had the authority to accept, on</p> <p>19 behalf of plaintiff, the responsibility for having</p> <p>20 caused the NAV error?</p> <p>21 A Ultimately Jim Dondero, as president here,</p> <p>22 had that authority.</p> <p>23 Q Okay. And then it says, quote: "The</p> <p>24 plaintiff ultimately, whether through insurance or</p> <p>25 its own funds, compensated the defendant."</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 172</p> <p>1 Dustin Norris</p> <p>2 Do you see that?</p> <p>3 A Yes.</p> <p>4 Q Is that statement accurate?</p> <p>5 MR. RUKAVINA: I'll object to</p> <p>6 vagueness, given the different points in</p> <p>7 time.</p> <p>8 BY MR. MORRIS:</p> <p>9 Q Does HCMFA believe that that statement is</p> <p>10 accurate today?</p> <p>11 A We know now. It's come out in discovery</p> <p>12 that -- and it was represented that Mr. Dondero</p> <p>13 transferred money to Highland who transferred it</p> <p>14 to HCMFA. And I don't know -- and it says "or,"</p> <p>15 "or its own funds." So it's accurate whether</p> <p>16 through insurance or its own funds.</p> <p>17 But at the time of this writing, we</p> <p>18 didn't have all the details and have firmed up</p> <p>19 those details, and I would refer you to</p> <p>20 depositions and the pleadings and our additional</p> <p>21 statement regarding cash and movement.</p> <p>22 Q Did Highland file an insurance claim, to</p> <p>23 the best of your knowledge?</p> <p>24 A Not that I know of.</p> <p>25 Q Did you ever ask anybody, in preparation</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 173</p> <p>1 Dustin Norris</p> <p>2 for today's deposition, about that sentence in</p> <p>3 Paragraph 42 and whether or not Highland had ever</p> <p>4 filed an insurance claim?</p> <p>5 A I didn't ask about that sentence, but we</p> <p>6 did discuss whether Highland had filed an</p> <p>7 insurance claim. And to our knowledge, we don't</p> <p>8 know that they have. I'd, again, ask you as their</p> <p>9 attorney. That would be a question for you.</p> <p>10 Q Well, with all due respect, you have</p> <p>11 complete and unfettered access to the former</p> <p>12 president and CFO of Highland; correct?</p> <p>13 A I do, but -- I'm sorry. You said</p> <p>14 president and CEO?</p> <p>15 Q The former president and CFO.</p> <p>16 A President and -- I don't have unfettered</p> <p>17 access to the former CFO.</p> <p>18 MR. RUKAVINA: I'll -- I'll object</p> <p>19 to that. We have been prohibited by</p> <p>20 Waterhouse's attorney from discussing the</p> <p>21 matter with him.</p> <p>22 BY MR. MORRIS:</p> <p>23 Q You're -- you're not allowed -- did -- did</p> <p>24 you -- did HCMFA ask Mr. Waterhouse at any time</p> <p>25 whether Highland had filed an insurance claim?</p>

<p>Page 174</p> <p>1 Dustin Norris</p> <p>2 A Not -- not that I know of. However, we've</p> <p>3 been not permitted to talk to him related to this,</p> <p>4 based on his attorney. So --</p> <p>5 Q Well, when did --</p> <p>6 A We never really discussed -- go ahead.</p> <p>7 Q I'm sorry.</p> <p>8 A Go ahead. You were --</p> <p>9 Q I was just going to ask: When did that</p> <p>10 prohibition go into effect?</p> <p>11 MR. RUKAVINA: John, the witness</p> <p>12 wouldn't know that. It's about three</p> <p>13 months ago that the lady from Baker</p> <p>14 McKenzie, Deb -- I don't know her last</p> <p>15 name -- got angry at me because I tried to</p> <p>16 talk to Frank and she said, "Absolutely</p> <p>17 not. You're forbidden, and you're</p> <p>18 violating your ethical rules if you do."</p> <p>19 MR. MORRIS: So sometime in</p> <p>20 September?</p> <p>21 MR. RUKAVINA: I would say August</p> <p>22 or September.</p> <p>23 MR. MORRIS: Okay.</p> <p>24 BY MR. MORRIS:</p> <p>25 Q But sometime -- but you had -- HCMFA had</p>	<p>Page 175</p> <p>1 Dustin Norris</p> <p>2 complete, unfettered access to Mr. Waterhouse from</p> <p>3 the time he left Highland in early March 2021</p> <p>4 until at least the end of July 2021; right?</p> <p>5 A Yeah. And I would add a point to</p> <p>6 Mr. Sauter's declaration and our pleadings and the</p> <p>7 depositions for the various details of what we've</p> <p>8 discovered since. However, the unfettered access</p> <p>9 was also inhibited -- or -- or Mr. Sauter</p> <p>10 represented this. There was a lot going on in</p> <p>11 March, April, May of 2021.</p> <p>12 Q Yeah.</p> <p>13 A And we were trying to lift out an entire</p> <p>14 business and keep everything afloat, and -- as</p> <p>15 you're very aware. And so there was a lot going</p> <p>16 on.</p> <p>17 Q Right. Right.</p> <p>18 Do you see -- can we go to</p> <p>19 Paragraph 43, please?</p> <p>20 A Yes.</p> <p>21 MR. MORRIS: If we could just</p> <p>22 scroll down to Paragraph 43, please.</p> <p>23 Thank you.</p> <p>24 BY MR. MORRIS:</p> <p>25 Q Now, again, this amended complaint is</p>
<p>Page 176</p> <p>1 Dustin Norris</p> <p>2 filed is July 2006; correct?</p> <p>3 A July 6th, not July 2006.</p> <p>4 Q I apologize. Let me ask the question</p> <p>5 again.</p> <p>6 This amended answer was filed on</p> <p>7 July 6th, 2021; correct?</p> <p>8 A Correct.</p> <p>9 Q And it was filed after Mr. Sauter</p> <p>10 conducted his investigation to determine the</p> <p>11 circumstances surrounding the note; correct?</p> <p>12 A Uh-huh, correct.</p> <p>13 Q And it was filed after HCMFA had had in</p> <p>14 its possession since January copies of the notes</p> <p>15 that Highland was suing on; correct?</p> <p>16 A Correct.</p> <p>17 Q And it was filed at a time before any</p> <p>18 limitation or prohibition was placed on HCMFA's</p> <p>19 ability to communicate with Mr. Waterhouse since</p> <p>20 the time he had left Highland; correct?</p> <p>21 A Sorry. You want to repeat the first part</p> <p>22 of that?</p> <p>23 Q Sure.</p> <p>24 It was filed at a time after</p> <p>25 Mr. Waterhouse left the employ of Highland but</p>	<p>Page 177</p> <p>1 Dustin Norris</p> <p>2 before there was any limitation or restriction</p> <p>3 imposed on HCMFA's ability to communicate with</p> <p>4 Mr. Waterhouse?</p> <p>5 A Yes. Once he left in March of 2021 is</p> <p>6 when that happened. And, again, in March, we</p> <p>7 were, on both sides, the creation of Skyview, as</p> <p>8 well as our employees, trying as -- doing</p> <p>9 everything we could do to transition the</p> <p>10 businesses and services. And so that was an</p> <p>11 important time.</p> <p>12 MR. MORRIS: Okay. Move to strike.</p> <p>13 BY MR. MORRIS:</p> <p>14 Q I just want to confirm that HCMFA had</p> <p>15 unfettered access to Mr. Waterhouse between the</p> <p>16 time he left Highland and the time this amended</p> <p>17 answer was filed in July.</p> <p>18 A We had access to him to ask him what we</p> <p>19 needed. Unfettered in the sense of, "Hey, we can</p> <p>20 access you whenever we need," no, because there</p> <p>21 was a lot involved in launching and -- launching</p> <p>22 of Skyview and creating all the services needed</p> <p>23 for our funds since we -- HCMFP is sharing</p> <p>24 services provided --</p> <p>25 Q Does Mr. Sauter have a role with HCMFA?</p>

<p>Page 178</p> <p>1 Dustin Norris</p> <p>2 A I don't believe so.</p> <p>3 Q Do you know who authorized him to conduct</p> <p>4 this investigation?</p> <p>5 A Yeah. It would have been management,</p> <p>6 Mr. Dondero, and probably our outside counsel. At</p> <p>7 the time, we had been utilizing Highland's</p> <p>8 services as legal services, all the way up until</p> <p>9 the end of February.</p> <p>10 There were legal and compliance</p> <p>11 services that were part of the shared services</p> <p>12 agreement. There was an entire legal team, entire</p> <p>13 team of litigators who were unable to work on</p> <p>14 this.</p> <p>15 Mr. Sauter was a real estate attorney</p> <p>16 for us, and he picked up the slack and was</p> <p>17 assigned by Mr. Dondero to help in these causes</p> <p>18 working with outside counsel, because HCMLP was</p> <p>19 not providing or no longer able to provide those</p> <p>20 legal services based on their -- their view, even</p> <p>21 though they were contracted to do those.</p> <p>22 Q That contract ended at the end of</p> <p>23 February; isn't that right?</p> <p>24 A That's correct.</p> <p>25 Q And with the exception of a couple of</p>	<p>Page 179</p> <p>1 Dustin Norris</p> <p>2 people, Highland's legal team migrated to Skyview</p> <p>3 in early 2021; is that fair?</p> <p>4 A Yes.</p> <p>5 Q Okay. And among the people who migrated</p> <p>6 were Stephanie Vitiello; correct?</p> <p>7 A Yes.</p> <p>8 Q And Isaac Leventon; correct?</p> <p>9 A Correct.</p> <p>10 Q And he's the chief litigation guy at</p> <p>11 Highland prior to the bankruptcy; right?</p> <p>12 A I -- I don't know if that was Isaac or if</p> <p>13 it was Scott Ellington. I don't know.</p> <p>14 Q And Scott -- Scott Ellington also</p> <p>15 migrated; right?</p> <p>16 A Correct.</p> <p>17 Q So you had access to those folks for the</p> <p>18 first six months of 2021; right?</p> <p>19 A No. I would -- our position is that those</p> <p>20 individuals were unable to work on -- even though</p> <p>21 they had left, they were unable to work on</p> <p>22 something of this nature.</p> <p>23 I -- I believe there was also a</p> <p>24 preliminary injunction still in place where Jim or</p> <p>25 his employees could not talk to Scott or Isaac. I</p>
<p>Page 180</p> <p>1 Dustin Norris</p> <p>2 don't remember all the specific details, but the</p> <p>3 legal team at Highland -- or at Skyview was not</p> <p>4 working on this.</p> <p>5 Q Okay.</p> <p>6 A It was probably professional -- I don't</p> <p>7 know the standards, but they were unable to work</p> <p>8 on -- on this.</p> <p>9 Q All right. But you would agree that at</p> <p>10 the time HCMFA asked the court for permission to</p> <p>11 amend its answer, it did so based on Mr. Sauter's</p> <p>12 investigation; correct?</p> <p>13 A Yes, and I would caveat that subject to</p> <p>14 our -- our pleadings.</p> <p>15 Q Right. And I think I moved to strike your</p> <p>16 earlier answer, so let me try and ask the question</p> <p>17 again.</p> <p>18 Did Mr. Dondero authorize Mr. Sauter</p> <p>19 to conduct the investigation?</p> <p>20 A I don't have specific knowledge of that.</p> <p>21 Q All right. I think you used the phrase</p> <p>22 "management." Did management authorize Mr. Sauter</p> <p>23 to conduct this investigation on behalf of HCMFA?</p> <p>24 A I don't know specifically who -- who would</p> <p>25 have asked him to do the -- Jim and -- Jim Dondero</p>	<p>Page 181</p> <p>1 Dustin Norris</p> <p>2 asked him to help with the -- the legal items, and</p> <p>3 stepped in and help in the absence of HCMLP's</p> <p>4 help.</p> <p>5 Q Okay. And based on that investigation</p> <p>6 looking at Paragraph 43, HCMFA took the position,</p> <p>7 quote: "Waterhouse signed the two promissory</p> <p>8 notes the subject of the complaint," close quote;</p> <p>9 correct?</p> <p>10 A That's right. It's our position that</p> <p>11 at -- and I'd refer you to our amended pleading</p> <p>12 with additional information, but it's -- it's our</p> <p>13 position that Mr. Waterhouse saw the notes, was</p> <p>14 confronted, discussed with DC, and said, "Look,</p> <p>15 that's my signature. I signed them."</p> <p>16 Q Okay. So that's -- and it was on the</p> <p>17 basis of Mr. Waterhouse's conversation with</p> <p>18 Mr. Sauter that HCMFA wrote that sentence; is that</p> <p>19 fair?</p> <p>20 A I believe so. And I would refer you to</p> <p>21 Mr. Sauter's declaration as well, which goes into</p> <p>22 details on that.</p> <p>23 Q And Mr. Sauter specifically said that</p> <p>24 Mr. Waterhouse signed the notes; correct?</p> <p>25 A We can look at Mr. Sauter's declaration.</p>

<p>Page 182</p> <p>1 Dustin Norris</p> <p>2 I -- I believe he said he was -- Mr. Waterhouse</p> <p>3 told him he signed, but --</p> <p>4 Q Right. And, in fact, HCMFA's position</p> <p>5 throughout this entire case was that</p> <p>6 Mr. Waterhouse signed the notes, but he did so by</p> <p>7 mistake and without authority; correct?</p> <p>8 A That's right. And if you look at the</p> <p>9 depositions, he testified of that, that he didn't</p> <p>10 remember signing them, and he didn't have a</p> <p>11 recollection, and Mr. Dondero never told him to</p> <p>12 sign it, and he never asked him whether -- or</p> <p>13 he -- Mr. Dondero told him never -- told him</p> <p>14 shouldn't be -- didn't -- Mr. Dondero didn't tell</p> <p>15 him it was a note, and he never asked if it should</p> <p>16 be a note.</p> <p>17 With this -- this amended pleading,</p> <p>18 the thought was he mistakenly thought it was a</p> <p>19 note, because that was the practice for other</p> <p>20 notes or other -- other transfers of this</p> <p>21 nature -- not of this nature, but other transfers</p> <p>22 between companies, and so he had papered it up as</p> <p>23 a note.</p> <p>24 But if you look at the depositions,</p> <p>25 you'll see that additional details came out that</p>	<p>Page 183</p> <p>1 Dustin Norris</p> <p>2 he told his controller, Mr. Klos, to transfer the</p> <p>3 funds, and Mr. Klos then turned around and asked</p> <p>4 Kristin to paper it up as a note, and to transfer</p> <p>5 the cash. And Ms. Hendrix -- Kristin Hendrix then</p> <p>6 added Mr. Waterhouse's JPEG signature to the Word</p> <p>7 document, which then was filed away.</p> <p>8 So we -- we, through the process of</p> <p>9 depositions and discovery, were able to find more</p> <p>10 information that Frank Waterhouse did not</p> <p>11 remember. He didn't remember signing but said his</p> <p>12 signature is on there, so he must have signed it.</p> <p>13 MR. MORRIS: All right. I move to</p> <p>14 strike. My question is really, really</p> <p>15 simple.</p> <p>16 BY MR. MORRIS:</p> <p>17 Q Up until the time that you filed the</p> <p>18 motion last night, HCMFA's publicly stated</p> <p>19 position has always been that Frank Waterhouse</p> <p>20 signed the notes, and that he did so by mistake</p> <p>21 and without authority; correct?</p> <p>22 A Correct. It says it here:</p> <p>23 "Mr. Waterhouse made a mistake in preparing and</p> <p>24 signing the notes for the defendant."</p> <p>25 Q Okay. Good enough.</p>
<p>Page 184</p> <p>1 Dustin Norris</p> <p>2 A And then it says: "Upon information" --</p> <p>3 Q That's --</p> <p>4 A -- "and belief, Waterhouse was not aware</p> <p>5 that the payment from the plaintiff to defendant</p> <p>6 were to compensate the defendant for the NAV</p> <p>7 error."</p> <p>8 Q I'm sorry. Where are you reading from?</p> <p>9 Oh, that's 44?</p> <p>10 A That's in number 44.</p> <p>11 Q Okay.</p> <p>12 A Yeah. "Waterhouse made a mistake in</p> <p>13 preparing and signing the notes for the</p> <p>14 defendant."</p> <p>15 Q Right. Okay.</p> <p>16 A But, again, I'll refer you to the</p> <p>17 depositions and the evidence --</p> <p>18 MR. MORRIS: Move to strike. It's</p> <p>19 not responsive to my question.</p> <p>20 BY MR. MORRIS:</p> <p>21 Q Do you see in Paragraph 47 there's a</p> <p>22 reference to "lack of consideration"?</p> <p>23 A Yes.</p> <p>24 Q Okay. What does that mean?</p> <p>25 A My understanding is that there was no</p>	<p>Page 185</p> <p>1 Dustin Norris</p> <p>2 consideration. We -- there were notes, but there</p> <p>3 was no payment for those notes. The payment was</p> <p>4 for compensation related to the NAV error, so</p> <p>5 there was no payment -- or no compensation for</p> <p>6 notes that had been drafted.</p> <p>7 Q Okay. And the next defense there in</p> <p>8 Paragraph 47 is "mutual mistake."</p> <p>9 Do you see that?</p> <p>10 A Correct.</p> <p>11 Q Do you have any facts that support that,</p> <p>12 that the mistake was mutual?</p> <p>13 A Yeah. I -- I would look to the</p> <p>14 depositions. And if you go to the testimony of</p> <p>15 Frank and Jim Dondero and David Klos and Kristin,</p> <p>16 it was a clear path and a clear record of mutual</p> <p>17 mistake.</p> <p>18 Jim told Frank to transfer the money</p> <p>19 for the NAV error. Frank then goes, tells</p> <p>20 Mr. Klos, the controller, to go and transfer the</p> <p>21 money, who tells Kristin to transfer the money --</p> <p>22 or to make the transfer and to paper it up.</p> <p>23 Kristin then papers it up, following the process</p> <p>24 that she's always followed or she said she's</p> <p>25 followed for many other notes.</p>

<p>Page 186</p> <p>1 Dustin Norris</p> <p>2 She lacked the authority to do so.</p> <p>3 Mr. Klos lacked the authority. Mr. Waterhouse was</p> <p>4 never told to make a note, and so the note itself</p> <p>5 is drafted by an accountant without authority to</p> <p>6 do so with a maker and a counterparty that is on</p> <p>7 both sides of this, representing supposedly both</p> <p>8 sides.</p> <p>9 And our position is that the maker of</p> <p>10 this -- even if you look at the document, Frank</p> <p>11 Waterhouse signs as maker, not as his position.</p> <p>12 He's signing as the maker.</p> <p>13 And so there's various aspects of this</p> <p>14 that had errors on both sides, the -- the position</p> <p>15 of HCMFA where they thought they had authority and</p> <p>16 the position of HCMLP.</p> <p>17 Q Anything else, sir?</p> <p>18 A I -- I would refer you to the -- again,</p> <p>19 the depositions and our pleadings. But there's --</p> <p>20 there's a host of support there.</p> <p>21 Q Other than the deposition transcripts and</p> <p>22 the -- and HCMFA's pleadings, are you aware of any</p> <p>23 document anywhere in the world that corroborates</p> <p>24 the defense of mutual mistake?</p> <p>25 A Other than the documents, the pleadings,</p>	<p>Page 187</p> <p>1 Dustin Norris</p> <p>2 and any schedules and other forms that are filed</p> <p>3 with the court, there's -- there's plenty there.</p> <p>4 Q Okay. What schedules are you referring</p> <p>5 to?</p> <p>6 A I would say all of your supporting</p> <p>7 schedules, all of your documentation, the notes</p> <p>8 themselves, the -- the Word documents that we</p> <p>9 received as well in discovery that have the</p> <p>10 metadata showing that Kristin Hendrix applied</p> <p>11 Frank Waterhouse's JPEG signature.</p> <p>12 Q Okay.</p> <p>13 A All of those items as well as, again,</p> <p>14 depositions all -- of all those individuals.</p> <p>15 Q So -- so I just want to make sure that I</p> <p>16 have this clear.</p> <p>17 So you've got the JPEG documents.</p> <p>18 You've got the deposition transcripts. You know</p> <p>19 what? Let me restate the question.</p> <p>20 You've identified the JPEG documents.</p> <p>21 Other than the JPEG documents, are you aware of</p> <p>22 any document in the world that was created before</p> <p>23 the answer date that supports or corroborates the</p> <p>24 defense of mutual mistake?</p> <p>25 A I'm -- again, I -- I'd point to the --</p>
<p>Page 188</p> <p>1 Dustin Norris</p> <p>2 let -- let me take a look here again.</p> <p>3 Q What is it you're looking at?</p> <p>4 A This is the amended complaint.</p> <p>5 Q Okay.</p> <p>6 A Which paragraph was that again?</p> <p>7 Q It's 47.</p> <p>8 A 47.</p> <p>9 Q Yeah. There's -- it's a -- there's --</p> <p>10 A Mutual mistake.</p> <p>11 Q -- one of the defenses there. It's up on</p> <p>12 the screen.</p> <p>13 A Yeah.</p> <p>14 Q There's "mutual mistake," and I just want</p> <p>15 you to identify for me every document that HCMFA</p> <p>16 is aware of that was created before the answer</p> <p>17 date of March 1st, 2001 [sic], other than the JPEG</p> <p>18 documents --</p> <p>19 A I would -- I would refer you to --</p> <p>20 Q -- that support or corroborate -- that</p> <p>21 support or corroborate the defense of mutual</p> <p>22 mistake?</p> <p>23 A Yeah. And I'd also point you to DC</p> <p>24 Sauter's declaration.</p> <p>25 Q Okay. That wasn't created before the</p>	<p>Page 189</p> <p>1 Dustin Norris</p> <p>2 answer date; correct?</p> <p>3 A Well, you're saying -- you -- it was</p> <p>4 before the answer date.</p> <p>5 Q Pardon me?</p> <p>6 A The answer date being when we did the</p> <p>7 amended answer?</p> <p>8 Q No. Let me ask the question again.</p> <p>9 A Yes, please. Sorry.</p> <p>10 Q Can you identify any document in the</p> <p>11 world, other than the JPEG documents, that support</p> <p>12 or corroborate the defense of mutual mistake that</p> <p>13 was created before March 1st, 2021?</p> <p>14 A I got you.</p> <p>15 The JPEG documents is the Word</p> <p>16 documents with the metadata.</p> <p>17 Q Correct.</p> <p>18 A There were emails that went between the</p> <p>19 accounting team on how to paper it up. That is in</p> <p>20 your -- your documentation as well, and I would</p> <p>21 say any other document that's in the court</p> <p>22 filings.</p> <p>23 Q Can you identify them? That's kind of --</p> <p>24 that's not really helpful to me.</p> <p>25 A Yeah. I -- there's the -- there's an</p>

<p>Page 190</p> <p>1 Dustin Norris</p> <p>2 email -- and this was used in depositions.</p> <p>3 There's an email that went -- was David Klos</p> <p>4 instructing the group -- or instructing Kristin to</p> <p>5 send the cash and to record a note.</p> <p>6 Q And you believe that -- and it's HCMFA's</p> <p>7 contention that that document supports their</p> <p>8 position of mutual mistake. Do I have that right?</p> <p>9 A Again, I'm not an attorney, so tying the</p> <p>10 definition as little M, little M, I'm going to</p> <p>11 have to say I don't know.</p> <p>12 Q Okay. Other than the emails, the two</p> <p>13 emails that you referenced and the JPEG documents,</p> <p>14 can you identify any other document created before</p> <p>15 May 1st -- March 1st, 2021, that supports or</p> <p>16 corroborates the defense of mutual mistake?</p> <p>17 A There may be a document. I -- I don't</p> <p>18 know.</p> <p>19 Q Okay.</p> <p>20 A And, again, as you've seen, there's a lot</p> <p>21 of stuff that's come out in discovery, and it's</p> <p>22 important that testimony of -- of those witnesses</p> <p>23 is taken into account.</p> <p>24 MR. MORRIS: Okay. Move to strike</p> <p>25 the last portion of that answer.</p>	<p>Page 191</p> <p>1 Dustin Norris</p> <p>2 Let's take a short break. I may be</p> <p>3 done. It's 4:09. Can we just come back</p> <p>4 in six minutes?</p> <p>5 THE WITNESS: Yes. Thank you.</p> <p>6 MR. RUKAVINA: Sure.</p> <p>7 MR. MORRIS: Thank you.</p> <p>8 (Recess from 3:09 p.m. to 3:19 p.m. CST)</p> <p>9 BY MR. MORRIS:</p> <p>10 Q Just a couple more questions, Mr. Norris.</p> <p>11 If you can take a look again at</p> <p>12 Paragraph 47 of the amended answer.</p> <p>13 A Yes.</p> <p>14 Q Do you see there's also a reference to,</p> <p>15 quote, "the lack of authority from the defendant</p> <p>16 to Waterhouse," close quote?</p> <p>17 A Yes.</p> <p>18 Q HCMFA does not dispute that Mr. Waterhouse</p> <p>19 was an officer of HCMFA in May of 2019, does it?</p> <p>20 A No, we don't dispute that.</p> <p>21 Q And HCMFA doesn't dispute that</p> <p>22 Mr. Waterhouse, in fact, served as the treasurer</p> <p>23 of HCMFA in May 2019; correct?</p> <p>24 A We don't, no.</p> <p>25 Q Okay. Is the sole basis for the assertion</p>
<p>Page 192</p> <p>1 Dustin Norris</p> <p>2 that Mr. Waterhouse lacked authority was that</p> <p>3 Mr. Dondero did not specifically approve it?</p> <p>4 A By nature, just the size of this note and</p> <p>5 the nature of it would have required Mr. Dondero's</p> <p>6 authority. And both Mr. Waterhouse and</p> <p>7 Mr. Dondero testified to that in their deposition.</p> <p>8 So I'd refer you to that. They both testified he</p> <p>9 did not have the authority.</p> <p>10 MR. MORRIS: I'm not sure that he</p> <p>11 did, so I'm going to move to strike. The</p> <p>12 testimony will be what the testimony will</p> <p>13 be, not your characterization of it.</p> <p>14 BY MR. MORRIS:</p> <p>15 Q But what about the size of the notes</p> <p>16 causes HCMFA to contend that Mr. Waterhouse didn't</p> <p>17 have authority?</p> <p>18 A A seven and a half million dollar note is</p> <p>19 large enough to rise that Jim Dondero would have,</p> <p>20 in any instance, authorized or needed to authorize</p> <p>21 this, and he did not.</p> <p>22 Q And is that because a \$7.4 million note is</p> <p>23 a substantial obligation for HCMFA?</p> <p>24 A You know, substantial -- define</p> <p>25 "substantial." It's sizeable. Right? It's seven</p>	<p>Page 193</p> <p>1 Dustin Norris</p> <p>2 and a half million dollars. Overall from the</p> <p>3 operating business, it was meaningful. But seven</p> <p>4 and a half million dollars in any entity would</p> <p>5 have required Jim Dondero's approval.</p> <p>6 Q And so can you explain to me why, if it</p> <p>7 would have required his approval, nobody at HCMFA</p> <p>8 noticed that it was carried on HCMFA's books and</p> <p>9 records as a liability since May of 2019?</p> <p>10 A Yeah. I think it's a simple mistake.</p> <p>11 There were other notes of a similar nature in</p> <p>12 size. And as Mr. Dondero testified, he wasn't</p> <p>13 reviewing these regularly, the balance sheet.</p> <p>14 Frank Waterhouse was. The accounting team was.</p> <p>15 And so the HCMFA side, there was other notes of</p> <p>16 similar size and nature. It didn't occur to them</p> <p>17 that there was new notes. The accounting team, as</p> <p>18 we've -- which is our position, created the notes,</p> <p>19 added the signature of Mr. Waterhouse, and then</p> <p>20 they continued to record those as liabilities on</p> <p>21 the balance sheet. And --</p> <p>22 Q Is --</p> <p>23 A -- that was -- you had -- and, again, I'd</p> <p>24 refer you to our pleadings and our amended</p> <p>25 pleadings and the recent pleading yesterday that</p>

<p>Page 194</p> <p>1 Dustin Norris</p> <p>2 we discovered in the discovery process. But</p> <p>3 Kristin Hendrix and Dave Klos and Frank Waterhouse</p> <p>4 made it very clear what the process -- and I would</p> <p>5 say why -- in answer to your question, it was</p> <p>6 probably a little sloppy. It may have cut</p> <p>7 corners. They should have received Mr. Dondero's</p> <p>8 authorization, and they didn't. And so</p> <p>9 that's -- that's our position.</p> <p>10 Q Does --</p> <p>11 A And I would say these are all</p> <p>12 professionals. These are good people. I don't</p> <p>13 think they were dishonest. I think they made a</p> <p>14 mistake. Professionals make mistakes, but this</p> <p>15 was a costly mistake.</p> <p>16 Q Did -- does -- does HCMFA contest that</p> <p>17 Frank Waterhouse knew, on May 2nd and May 3rd,</p> <p>18 2019, that the corporate accounting group was</p> <p>19 going to paper these transactions as loans?</p> <p>20 A Again, I would refer you to the actual</p> <p>21 depositions and pleadings -- and our pleadings.</p> <p>22 But our position is -- sorry. One more time, do</p> <p>23 you want to ask the question?</p> <p>24 Q Yeah. I think you need to -- I want to</p> <p>25 try to finish up, and I really appreciate your</p>	<p>Page 195</p> <p>1 Dustin Norris</p> <p>2 patience.</p> <p>3 MR. RUKAVINA: And I'll just say,</p> <p>4 John, that was a bit of a confusing</p> <p>5 question.</p> <p>6 MR. MORRIS: Okay. And that's</p> <p>7 fair. Let me try again.</p> <p>8 BY MR. MORRIS:</p> <p>9 Q Does HCMFA contest that Frank Waterhouse</p> <p>10 knew, on May 2nd and May 3rd, 2019, that the</p> <p>11 corporate accounting group was going to paper the</p> <p>12 transfers from Highland as loans?</p> <p>13 A Did we contest that he knew that?</p> <p>14 Q Correct.</p> <p>15 A I think his testimony speaks -- I'll refer</p> <p>16 you to his testimony. I think he testified that</p> <p>17 he didn't know, right? He didn't know that</p> <p>18 they -- yes, he was copied on an email, but he</p> <p>19 didn't have any recollection that they were</p> <p>20 papered up as a loan.</p> <p>21 Q Okay. And on the basis of that testimony,</p> <p>22 does HCMFA now contend that Mr. Waterhouse didn't</p> <p>23 know, in May of 2019, that these transfers were</p> <p>24 papered as loans?</p> <p>25 A I would say that's part of it. I would,</p>
<p>Page 196</p> <p>1 Dustin Norris</p> <p>2 again, refer you to all the pleadings, our</p> <p>3 pleadings and depositions that -- of these</p> <p>4 individuals. There's -- there's a lot of support</p> <p>5 there.</p> <p>6 Q Right.</p> <p>7 Have you seen the emails from May 2nd</p> <p>8 and May 3rd?</p> <p>9 A I can't remember if they were included in</p> <p>10 your exhibits, but I know they were discussed in</p> <p>11 detail in the depositions from Dave Klos and</p> <p>12 Kristin and Frank.</p> <p>13 Q Right. Okay.</p> <p>14 MR. MORRIS: I have no further</p> <p>15 questions. This is not particularly</p> <p>16 helpful. Thanks.</p> <p>17 MR. RUKAVINA: Okay. I'll reserve</p> <p>18 questions. Thank you.</p> <p>19 MR. MORRIS: Okay. Thanks a lot.</p> <p>20 MR. RUKAVINA: Thank you.</p> <p>21 (Off the record at 3:25 p.m. CST)</p> <p>22</p> <p>23</p> <p>24</p> <p>25</p>	<p>Page 197</p> <p>1 IN THE UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT</p> <p>2 FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS</p> <p>3 DALLAS DIVISION</p> <p>4 In re:)Chapter 11</p> <p>5)</p> <p>6 HIGHLAND CAPITAL MANAGEMENT, LP,)</p> <p>7)Case No.</p> <p>8 Debtor.)19-34054-SGJ-11</p> <p>9)</p> <p>10 HIGHLAND CAPITAL MANAGEMENT, LP,)</p> <p>11)</p> <p>12 Plaintiff,)</p> <p>13)</p> <p>14 vs.)Advisory Proceeding No.</p> <p>15)21-03004</p> <p>16 NEXPOINT ADVISORS, LP; JAMES)</p> <p>17 DONDERO; NANCY DONDERO; and THE)</p> <p>18 DUGABOY INVESTMENT TRUST,)</p> <p>19)</p> <p>20 Defendants.)</p> <p>21)</p> <p>22</p> <p>23 REPORTER'S CERTIFICATION</p> <p>24 REMOTE DEPOSITION OF</p> <p>25 DUSTIN NORRIS</p> <p>December 1, 2021</p> <p>I, Rebecca A. Graziano, Certified Shorthand</p> <p>Reporter in and for the State of Texas, hereby</p> <p>certify to the following:</p> <p>That the witness, DUSTIN NORRIS, was duly</p> <p>sworn and that the transcript of the oral</p> <p>deposition is a true record of the testimony given</p> <p>by the witness;</p> <p>I further certify that pursuant to FRCP Rule</p> <p>30(f)(1) that the signature of the deponent:</p> <p>_____ was requested by the deponent or a</p> <p>party before the completion of the deposition and</p>

Page 198

1 returned within 30 days from date of receipt of
 2 the transcript. If returned, the attached Changes
 3 and Signature Page contains any changes and the
 4 reasons therefor.
 5 _____ was not requested by the deponent or a
 6 party before the completion of the deposition.
 7 I further certify that I am neither attorney
 8 nor counsel for, related to, nor employed by any
 9 of the parties to the action in which this
 10 testimony was taken.
 11 Further, I am not a relative or employee of
 12 any attorney of record in this cause, nor do I
 13 have a financial interest in the action.
 14 Subscribed and sworn to on this 1st day of
 15 December, 2021.

16
 17
 18
 19
 20 _____
 21 Rebecca A. Graziano, CSR, RMR, CRR
 22 Texas CSR 9306
 23 Expiration: 07/31/22
 24 California CSR 14407
 25 Expiration: 09/30/22
 Illinois CSR 084.004659
 Expiration: 05/31/23

Page 199

ERRATA SHEET

2 Case Name:

3 Deposition Date:

4 Deponent:

5 Pg. No. Now Reads Should Read Reason

6	_____	_____	_____
7	_____	_____	_____
8	_____	_____	_____
9	_____	_____	_____
10	_____	_____	_____
11	_____	_____	_____
12	_____	_____	_____
13	_____	_____	_____
14	_____	_____	_____
15	_____	_____	_____
16	_____	_____	_____
17	_____	_____	_____
18	_____	_____	_____
19	_____	_____	_____

20

21

22

Signature of Deponent

SUBSCRIBED AND SWORN BEFORE ME

23 THIS ____ DAY OF _____, 2021.

24 _____

25 (Notary Public) MY COMMISSION EXPIRES: _____

Index: \$12,286,000..7.4

\$	12-and-a-half 148:12	2.4-million-dollar 51:14	81:5	51:21 54:24 127:17 194:17 195:10 196:8
\$12,286,000 78:16 95:19 96:7	12/31 87:5	2000- 31:25	22nd 28:12 162:13	4
\$12.286 79:7 82:11, 15 83:14	12/31/2018 55:5	2001 188:17	23rd 95:6 100:2	42 168:24 169:12,16 173:3
\$12.4 147:9,13 149:25	12:05 56:14	2006 176:2,3	24th 9:19	43 169:6 175:19,22 181:6
\$2.4 50:18 51:18	12:11 103:2	2012 18:19 21:22	26th 24:11,15	44 169:6 184:9,10
\$5 50:21 51:21 107:7 108:13 109:4,5,7,13, 14 140:22 143:19 147:7,24 148:9 149:13,16	12:15 56:14 102:15	2013 21:25	28th 128:23 129:21 132:5	45 46:20,21 160:15 168:8,18,25 169:2,6
\$5.186 134:6	13 23:10,11,12 158:3, 8	2018 18:23,25 19:4 20:17 22:6,12,20 23:14,20 24:4,5,6,15 25:22 26:2,6 32:5,6 46:12,25 47:19 110:4 136:9 145:23 151:13, 15 153:2,10,18,24 154:13 155:9 157:5	2:06 150:24	47 184:21 185:8 188:7,8 191:12
\$7.4 48:21 63:24 82:16 134:17,24 135:5 138:6,16,23 140:9 146:21 147:6, 15 149:18 150:4 156:19 168:10,19 192:22	14 11:7	2018/2019 109:21	2:07 151:2	4:09 191:3
\$7.44 149:23	147 51:2,3	2019 18:23 19:3,5 20:22 21:7 24:20 28:15,19 32:5 42:25 43:2 47:7 49:6,10,22 50:21 55:10 59:5,7 103:20 104:13,15,19 105:10 107:12 109:4 120:16,18,19,23 128:23 129:22 132:5 134:6 136:9,14,17 137:3,7 146:18 151:6,13 153:3 154:18 157:5,8,14 168:20 191:19,23 193:9 194:18 195:10, 23	2:21 151:2	5
\$7.442 149:5	15 134:6 136:17 137:3,7	2020 19:11 32:2 33:18 39:8,12 41:3, 16 42:6 55:16 65:22 67:8 70:14,24 72:3 73:24 78:15 84:24 86:21,24 92:18 95:6, 9,13,16,23 96:8 97:23 98:10 99:11 101:15 102:6	2nd 28:15,18,21 50:18 51:14,17 54:24 127:17 194:17 195:10 196:7	5 9:17 29:10,13 158:21
\$7.5 82:12 133:17,23 146:13	15(c) 67:17,18 68:21 69:16 71:6 72:4 76:6, 19 77:4 87:2 88:7 92:12 99:5,8 101:11	2021 19:11 25:3,9,10 29:20 30:3,7,9,16,19 31:5,9 33:5 34:3,4,24 35:6 39:25 57:16 61:11,14 126:23 175:3,4,11 176:7 177:5 179:3,18 189:13 190:15	3	5.2 109:15
1	15th 136:23	21st 34:3,24 39:25	3 38:23 105:5	5.6 109:15
1 26:11 29:6,8 38:17, 21 163:2	17 48:12		30 86:24	59 71:21,22 89:19
10 11:7 52:16,21 57:6 63:2	18 153:2		30(b)(6) 5:18 7:10 9:9,25 15:18 22:25 36:18,25 37:10,15 42:3 49:15 57:6,8 63:2 64:16,22 75:23 79:5 82:10,14 84:4 92:16 95:11,18 116:6 132:5 141:19	6
100 26:14 80:19	182 119:9,10 124:13 125:20 152:21,22		30th 87:6 95:9,16,23 96:8 101:14 102:6 154:8,14	6 10:25 30:5
10:00 8:15	185 7:12,17,19		31st 46:11,25 47:18 154:9	6/30 94:24,25 153:22
10:01 5:2	18th 25:3 153:13		35 9:19 168:16	60 153:22 154:8
11 57:6 65:21	19 32:6 110:4 153:3 154:18		36 87:13,14	600 79:25
11:05 56:18	1940 67:18		38 160:14,22 168:8, 17,24,25 169:2	650 89:20
11:15 56:15	1:06 103:2		3:06 150:24	650-page 9:18
11:16 56:18	1st 20:17 23:14,20 24:4 25:21 26:2,5 29:20 30:3,7,9,16,19 31:5,9 33:5 34:4,24 35:6 49:10 61:11,14 126:22 166:19 167:4 188:17 189:13 190:15		3:09 191:8	6:05 92:18 93:18
11th 24:20	2		3:19 191:8	6th 92:18 93:18 97:14 161:24 162:14 164:2 176:3,7
12 27:19,21 36:14,18 82:13	2 78:4,6,10 82:16 85:9 86:8,10,19 89:8,9 90:20 92:19 93:22 95:8,14 98:9 141:4 158:14		3:20 150:25	7
			3:25 196:21	7 10:25 30:5
			3rd 28:15,19,21 39:8, 12,22 41:16 42:6 47:7 49:10,22 50:21	7.4 134:22 147:2

Index: 8..attached

<p>8</p> <p>8 10:25 25:10 141:19 142:10</p> <hr/> <p>9</p> <p>9 11:2,3 103:4 104:18 158:22</p> <p>9:00 8:14</p> <hr/> <p>A</p> <p>a.m. 5:2 56:18</p> <p>ability 30:24 31:4,8 33:4 34:23 176:19 177:3</p> <p>absence 181:3</p> <p>Absolutely 174:16</p> <p>accept 170:2,9 171:18</p> <p>accepted 169:17 170:6,7,22 171:3</p> <p>access 30:15,18,20 33:22,24 34:6,8 61:20 144:16 161:8 173:11,17 175:2,8 177:15,18,20 179:17</p> <p>accessible 32:3</p> <p>account 51:6 143:20 150:5 190:23</p> <p>accountant 63:9 186:5</p> <p>accountants 57:16 63:14</p> <p>accounted 52:23 53:13 63:6</p> <p>accounting 27:16 43:12,19 44:11 50:8 52:17 53:5,17,21 56:25 57:5 61:24 62:23,25 63:8,17 64:2,3 65:2 70:6 72:6 75:16 78:23 126:10 189:19 193:14,17 194:18 195:11</p>	<p>accounts 58:3,8,9</p> <p>accuracy 125:25</p> <p>accurate 7:2 25:18 44:3,24 45:20 65:15 74:17 75:3 76:3,11 80:8,15,19 81:20,23 94:2 125:21 126:6 127:14 172:4,10,15</p> <p>accused 120:8</p> <p>acknowledge 92:3 95:5</p> <p>acknowledged 51:24</p> <p>acknowledges 51:24</p> <p>Act 67:18</p> <p>acting 80:4 126:23</p> <p>action 29:3</p> <p>actively 144:17</p> <p>actual 40:17 41:10 136:22 144:9 194:20</p> <p>add 79:12,13 175:5</p> <p>added 18:20 183:6 193:19</p> <p>addition 149:16 171:6</p> <p>additional 53:4 54:15 84:13 122:4 149:18 167:7 168:4 169:6 172:20 181:12 182:25</p> <p>address 53:5</p> <p>addressed 127:11</p> <p>addressing 101:9 109:22</p> <p>adoption 131:23 132:8</p> <p>adversary 28:8</p> <p>advise 124:8</p> <p>advised 130:16</p> <p>adviser 33:20 53:17 64:4 68:16 69:24 75:18 83:18 106:7 123:19 127:24 128:4</p>	<p>129:11 130:17 141:17 170:4</p> <p>advisers 21:2,6,12, 25 22:12,19 32:16 40:23 45:3,9 67:4 71:11 72:2,9,12,23 73:3 75:6 77:6,12 78:14 84:23,24 86:6 90:23 97:2,5,13 99:17</p> <p>advisers' 94:19 96:21</p> <p>Advisors 5:19,22 18:7 19:25 20:7,23 21:2 33:9,17 78:13</p> <p>advisory 66:3,6,9</p> <p>affiliate 93:5</p> <p>affiliates 60:18 79:22 90:22</p> <p>affirmative 30:13 50:4 53:6 158:25 167:20 168:8,18</p> <p>afloat 175:14</p> <p>aggregate 48:21</p> <p>agree 42:8 57:4 77:5, 9 95:11,19 101:22 112:4 131:2 132:4 138:15 147:23 151:24 163:23 165:12 180:9</p> <p>agreed 138:5 163:21</p> <p>agreeing 104:4</p> <p>agreement 9:6 34:14 44:11 60:17 61:25 62:15 68:24 70:10 74:20 75:22 77:22 81:8,9 111:9 113:20, 22 128:21 138:4,13, 23,25 139:2,10 140:4,9 142:25 150:12 164:23 170:16 178:12</p> <p>agreements 66:10, 12,15</p> <p>ahead 14:17 70:13 71:16,17 101:7 174:6,8</p>	<p>allegedly 121:15,22</p> <p>allocation 105:3 106:8 118:21 122:24 123:2 125:22</p> <p>allowed 13:11 173:23</p> <p>amend 9:11 104:4,7 159:24 164:7 180:11</p> <p>amended 7:24 8:13 9:4,24 10:21 11:8 35:17,18 54:17,18 55:6 63:12,20 158:11,14 159:3,5,9, 21 160:7 161:2 164:2,5 167:10,15, 21,22 175:25 176:6 177:16 181:11 182:17 188:4 189:7 191:12 193:24</p> <p>amount 70:16 79:8 82:17 107:6 109:15, 22 154:23</p> <p>amounts 48:25 49:3 65:24 78:11 79:21 82:25 90:21 91:12 93:3 101:19,22,24 105:14 134:20</p> <p>analysis 67:17 68:21 69:16 72:4 106:25 113:24 114:5,11 115:2 116:7 165:2</p> <p>analysts 27:12</p> <p>analyzed 121:2</p> <p>angry 174:15</p> <p>annual 66:12 67:20 88:7</p> <p>answering 6:15 64:7</p> <p>answers 6:3 7:2 35:16 63:20 75:10</p> <p>anticipated 80:15,16 115:25</p> <p>apologize 22:17 24:12 69:6 152:12 154:5 155:23 159:20 169:22 176:4</p> <p>appearing 82:20</p> <p>appears 30:6 49:18</p>	<p>51:6 95:24</p> <p>applied 187:10</p> <p>approaching 102:15</p> <p>approval 128:21 193:5,7</p> <p>approve 192:3</p> <p>approved 111:15 112:11 128:9,15 132:23 133:2</p> <p>approximately 26:9, 19 109:3,5 133:16,23 134:5 146:13 147:7 154:9 156:19</p> <p>April 13:14 19:3,5 20:22 21:6 22:16 24:20 25:10 104:13, 19 175:11</p> <p>argument 27:25 35:23 36:3 37:15</p> <p>arguments 85:14,16</p> <p>ascertain 58:6,14</p> <p>Asia 7:14 158:5</p> <p>asks 27:21 52:16</p> <p>aspect 34:9 67:24 97:24 99:24</p> <p>aspects 14:22 45:3,4 68:11 69:24 186:13</p> <p>assert 30:12</p> <p>assertion 191:25</p> <p>Asset 122:21</p> <p>assigned 178:17</p> <p>assistant 18:18,20 21:21 25:5,12</p> <p>assume 41:22 45:21, 23 47:24 48:24 49:2</p> <p>assuming 23:21,24 48:4 52:6,7</p> <p>assumption 45:25</p> <p>assumptions 45:22</p> <p>attached 28:20 161:22 162:20 163:7, 22</p>
---	--	--	---	---

Index: attachments..challenged

attachments 31:17	87:7 98:2 100:3	BBVA 51:7	135:20 156:10,24	called 5:17 8:23
attain 20:12	111:24 113:23	began 31:25 54:15	157:20	159:23 161:13
attempt 83:5	117:18 118:18 122:6	104:14,22 120:18	board's 77:7 90:2	calls 32:19 165:11
attended 67:16	124:23 125:17 127:2	begin 6:18	92:19 93:21	Canty 7:9,17 152:13,
attorney 5:9 83:8	130:8 145:18 150:6	beginning 8:16	boards 66:24 67:3	21 158:6
96:25 147:17 160:11	158:10 175:15 184:4	22:12,20 24:15	booked 53:20 54:11,	capacity 5:17 20:3
173:9,20 174:4	186:22 187:21	120:17 156:7,11,15	21 57:10,14 59:9	36:25 37:9,14 44:7,8,
178:15 190:9	188:16	behalf 5:18 10:7	64:23	10,13 75:25 77:17
attorney's 13:17	B	29:19 35:24 37:11,23	booking 56:22	137:19,21 171:2
audit 44:12 47:8,12,	back 13:13,14 17:13	40:3 43:8 64:7 68:20	57:11,20	capital 5:12,19,21,24
23 57:16 58:2 59:4,7	21:22 22:2 31:25	72:8,23 73:3 80:5	books 44:11 52:24	27:17 32:7 42:20
154:8	40:24 41:9,10 56:14	126:23 138:15 143:4,	53:13,16 54:7,12,23	52:5 61:22 108:19
audited 43:5,10 44:2,	64:7 68:23 69:17	6 144:10 150:20	55:7,14,20,23 56:21	123:15 124:21
12,23 45:5,19 46:10,	70:6 76:14 77:13	151:9 171:4,19	58:15,19,21,22 59:17	125:14 131:3 146:2,6
24 47:17,23 48:14,19	86:2,10 92:23 93:9,	180:23	60:24 61:5,13,21	169:20 171:3,4
49:20 55:2 57:24	12 94:7 96:16 102:22	belief 184:4	62:10 63:3,17 79:12	careful 16:25
58:12,16 64:17 65:10	150:25 152:5,13,19	believed 117:13	193:8	carefully 41:25 62:5
101:17	170:11 191:3	126:16 149:9 167:17	bottle 56:12	120:6 129:19 171:17
auditor 47:11	back-office 27:16	believes 118:5,15	bottom 87:21 102:8	carried 193:8
auditors 43:20 57:17	43:12 75:17	big 123:11	152:17 158:23	carrier 147:8 151:22
154:22 156:10	background 64:3	biggest 67:24	Brad 24:3,7,18	152:2
audits 153:19,22	160:25 161:7 166:22	bill 59:15	breach 148:24	carriers 152:7
August 86:25 99:4,6	backing 98:18 99:2,	billed 59:19,20	break 7:4 56:7	case 27:23 48:24
153:25 154:9,13	18 102:2	bind 6:4	150:24 191:2	49:2,18 67:21 76:17
155:9 174:21	backup 49:2 82:23	bit 37:21 48:5 88:17	Brian 25:5	81:10 182:5
author 77:18	83:4	126:2 133:9 151:4	bring 70:2	cash 14:7,11 52:10
authority 85:4 138:2	Baker 174:13	195:4	broad 35:21	108:14,16,18 134:15
169:8 171:18,22	balance 48:7 53:20	Blank 87:24	broadly 126:3	140:23 141:2 172:21
182:7 183:21 186:2,	55:5 58:23,24 59:2	board 9:9 32:17	broke 145:3	183:5 190:5
3,5,15 191:15 192:2,	65:6,15 87:5,6 92:10,	33:10,14 65:22 67:5,	broker 144:21,24	caused 121:22 137:7
6,9,17	20 93:22 94:5 96:4	8,16,19 70:15,25	broker-dealers	147:22 170:9,22
authorization 72:11	102:9 108:14,17	71:8,10 72:3,25	107:13	171:5,20
85:18 194:8	193:13,21	74:21 75:4 76:3,7,15	business 19:22	caution 16:20
authorize 143:8,12	bank 51:6,7 52:2	78:9,15 80:9 84:6,16,	68:6,14 107:18	caveat 180:13
180:18,22 192:20	104:6	19,23 86:7,12,13,22,	175:14 193:3	CC'D 95:3
authorized 72:9,24	bankruptcy 27:23	23 87:9 88:4,7,12,24	businesses 177:10	CEO 167:2 173:14
84:22 143:16 178:3	30:23 35:8 36:7	89:10 91:21 92:11	calculate 111:14	certificates 9:7 19:2
192:20	37:23 99:11 179:11	93:25 94:10,20 95:7,	call 8:23 61:19 67:17	20:14 23:22 25:20
aware 6:3 27:15	based 13:17 18:3	13,21 96:9 98:10,16,	125:7	CFO 39:17 45:7,13
28:7,13,17 29:2 31:7	25:15 34:12,25 45:25	22,25 99:3,4,7,12,16,	C	75:15 96:21 171:8
34:20 35:7,11,12,13,	46:3 57:17,25 142:13	20 100:18 101:10		173:12,15,17
23 36:5,6,12 37:9,14,	154:7 163:20 167:10	112:12 119:2,3,22		chain 81:2 91:16
19,22 39:15,21 47:10	168:4 171:11 174:4	123:3,8 125:21		challenge 105:11,15
49:8 52:12 56:2,25	178:20 180:11 181:5	126:6,13 127:6,11,12		challenged 100:24
57:3 59:6,16 62:6	basis 22:20 67:20	128:9,12,15,23		
67:8,12 71:3 84:14	167:19 181:17	129:2,21 130:7,14,		
85:2 86:13,15,16,19	191:25 195:21	15,18,21 131:5		
		132:6,23 133:3		

Index: change..correct

change 93:7 102:18 104:5,7 106:11,18	collateral 147:17,19 148:20	146:22 147:6,8 149:19 157:18 168:11,21 185:4,5	confirming 163:16	contest 194:16 195:9,13
changed 20:23 24:2 55:23 56:21 57:12,21 98:19	colleague 7:9		confronted 181:14	continue 10:24 29:18 144:17 148:14
changing 23:25	collect 28:9	competently 36:17	confused 81:6	continued 193:20
characterization 192:13	collectively 28:24	complaint 8:22 9:2 28:12,21 34:3 38:19, 20 39:25 40:18 161:2,23 162:2,25 163:4,7,23,25 166:14,21 167:10,15 175:25 181:8 188:4	confusing 195:4	continuing 24:20
characterize 164:20,25 165:4	color 53:4		confusion 81:13	continuous 22:19
characterizes 165:7	combination 134:14		connection 6:7 10:7 12:13 15:2 59:11 67:9 88:7 101:10 110:9,23 111:3 112:15 113:4,9,16 114:2,13,23 117:14 118:16 119:15 121:8 124:9 134:7 135:2 137:15 138:18 142:8, 20 144:7 146:22 147:9 149:14 166:3 168:22	contract 80:21 115:6 116:24 117:5 148:24 170:6 178:22
charged 43:9 81:18, 22	combined 134:22	complete 6:25 23:22 25:17 34:5,8 59:4 173:11 175:2		contracted 178:21
charts 73:22	comfortable 68:18 99:12	completed 6:16,19		contracts 66:19 67:11,19 69:9,12
check 9:17	commenced 28:8 29:3 64:18,25 161:21	completely 80:19 94:2		contribution 67:25
chief 19:20 20:4 32:15 33:13 179:10	commencement 40:9		consent 103:5,9,15, 19,23,24 104:3,8,9, 12,14,19,22 105:2, 10,20,21 106:6,8,10, 18,22 107:5,9,18 108:3,4,13,24 109:5, 9,12	control 121:4 130:9 137:20,21
circumstances 16:9 17:16 57:18 86:14 161:4 164:18 165:15 176:11	commentary 54:2	compliance 27:16 31:15 32:15,24 33:13 41:2,7 61:23 69:4 70:5 72:6,14 74:19, 23 76:15 77:25 106:14 126:9 170:14 178:10		controller 183:2 185:20
claim 141:20,23 142:2,4,19 143:6,9, 11,13,16,20,23,25 144:4,6,9,18 145:8, 16,21,24 148:16 149:10,14 151:8,12, 18 152:2 172:22 173:4,7,25	committee 111:10, 15 115:11	component 33:7 83:14	consented 104:10 105:6 107:23	controlling 26:21
claims 152:7,11	communicate 30:24 34:23 176:19 177:3	components 17:22	consequence 138:6	controls 26:15 122:4
clarification 37:8 74:12 123:4,5	communicated 150:12 170:12	concerned 35:25 36:8 124:24,25	consequences 109:22	conversation 117:22 181:17
clarify 69:17	communication 62:11 130:18 150:10	concerns 35:9 37:12,17,24 90:20 110:3	consideration 184:22 185:2	conversions 105:6,8, 9,13 107:25
clean 149:3 163:19	communications 27:22 65:22 84:5 121:2 123:8 171:11	conclude 49:14 155:15,24	consistent 51:16	converted 105:3
clear 79:14 185:16 187:16 194:4	companies 182:22	concluded 157:12	consultant 112:6 128:17	converting 105:25
close 83:20 181:8 191:16	company 14:4 36:22 39:15 64:7 143:2 146:5 147:14,20,21 161:13	conclusion 135:11 156:5 157:21	consultation 154:24	coordinating 41:12 115:12
closed-end 105:4,7 106:2,11,19 108:4	company's 12:10 53:2 139:8 142:4,6	conduct 47:12 138:7 178:3 180:19,23	contained 95:6	copied 73:11 90:4,16 91:15,21 92:3 99:23 195:18
closely 72:5 112:22	Compass 51:7	conducted 67:9 122:25 161:3 165:14 176:10	contemporaneousl y 55:10	copies 9:5 88:21 161:19 162:17 176:14
coffee 56:8	compensate 137:18 138:16 184:6	confirm 10:19 50:23 52:9 57:9 133:5 165:23 177:14	contend 42:4 85:17, 20 113:3 132:20 134:21 147:13 192:16 195:22	copy 30:2 89:14,16 91:19 167:25 168:2
collaborative 105:21 106:12	compensated 171:25	confirmed 11:23	contends 49:9 59:8 134:17,23 135:5 149:24	corners 194:7
	compensation 15:11 59:10,22 60:5, 14 61:2,16 62:9 63:6, 22 64:11 108:20 134:25 135:6 137:14 138:23 140:9,15,16		contention 42:8 132:24 146:20 190:7	corporate 194:18 195:11
				correct 9:20 10:3

Index: correction..difference

12:15,22 15:23 18:25 20:8,9,10 21:10 22:21 26:19 28:19 29:4,5,7,8 30:13,16, 19,25 31:5,6 34:7,18, 24 35:19 39:8,9 42:15,25 43:3 47:10, 13 48:23 49:24 51:19,21,25 54:25 55:18 57:6,21 59:12, 13 61:12 64:20,25 65:2 66:4,7,10,13,19, 25 67:2 69:10,13,14 70:17 71:2 72:4 74:3, 9 76:12 77:7,8,10 83:15 84:6 86:24 88:14,20,24 89:11 90:16 91:16 92:20,21 94:16,20 95:2,23 96:10,22,23 97:2,3,5, 8,10 100:10,14 101:2,11 103:20 106:23 107:21 108:10 114:13,20,24, 25 116:19 117:19 120:16 121:4,22 122:9 123:6 124:17, 18 127:18,19 128:24, 25 129:7 130:2 131:4,13 132:14,18 133:24 134:3,4,19 135:3,8 136:17,18 137:4,5,8 139:3 141:18 143:21,23 145:5 146:3,18,19, 24,25 147:11 149:5, 11,12,14,15,20,21,25 150:2 151:10,11 158:18 159:21 162:18 164:3,7,8,11 165:16,17,19,22 166:2 169:20 170:23 173:12 176:2,7,8,11, 12,15,16,20 178:24 179:6,8,9,16 180:12 181:9,24 182:7 183:21,22 185:10 189:2,17 191:23 195:14 correction 22:23 90:3 124:24 correctly 15:13 85:10 132:2 corroborate 188:20,	21 189:12 corroborates 61:15 62:7 186:23 187:23 190:16 cost 106:22 costly 194:15 costs 106:20 133:18 counsel 5:11 11:19 13:8 54:2 82:22 83:3 88:3 90:2 116:21 123:17,19,21,23 124:2,7 178:6,18 counterparty 186:6 couple 168:13 178:25 191:10 couple-month 105:18 court 27:24 30:23 35:8 36:3,7,11 37:16, 24 40:20 160:8 164:7 180:10 187:3 189:21 coverage 142:20 149:11 covered 98:16,24 99:16 100:17 created 42:18 61:14 62:7,17 63:4 147:21 187:22 188:16,25 189:13 190:14 193:18 creating 45:8 53:16 135:15 177:22 creation 177:7 CST 5:2 56:18 103:2 151:2 191:8 196:21 current 57:17 58:9 cut 194:6 <hr/> D <hr/> daily 40:19 41:11 damage 152:9 data 33:22 115:13 date 21:19 30:7,10 33:19 34:4 35:6,9,25	36:8 37:12,16,24 38:12,16 39:14 42:9 61:10 62:7 63:4 85:25 97:6 107:15,25 126:22 130:4,5 135:22 136:4,8 155:12 156:12 170:24 187:23 188:17 189:2,4,6 dated 28:14,18 30:3 127:15 dates 23:21,25 25:16 52:11 120:18 134:10 162:13 dating 21:22 Dave 12:3 80:14 95:4 171:8 194:3 196:11 David 25:5 185:15 190:3 Davor 7:18 12:14 56:10 139:23 142:3 163:16 day 34:3 51:25 days 153:22 154:8 DC 12:17,19 13:12 142:3 161:3 165:14 181:14 188:23 DC's 61:19 deals 160:15 Deb 174:14 debated 121:2 debtor 5:11 31:21 33:7,23 34:12 39:17 41:6 42:17 117:22 118:9 166:20 167:3 December 39:8,12, 22 40:17 41:3,16 42:6 46:11,25 47:18 55:16 decision 105:19,22, 23 106:17,21 108:2,3 138:2 declaration 9:4 13:15 16:14,18 17:19 31:16 54:17 61:19 164:14,16,23 165:5 167:19 175:6 181:21,	25 188:24 deductible 141:3,17 defendant 169:16,19 171:25 183:24 184:5, 6,14 191:15 defendant's 9:11 166:19 defending 41:11 defense 114:18,19 115:8 144:7 168:9,18 185:7 186:24 187:24 188:21 189:12 190:16 defenses 30:13 50:4 53:6 135:9 140:10 150:2 158:25 167:20 169:4,7 188:11 deferred 80:20 define 119:17 154:3 192:24 defined 46:7 153:5 Defines 132:19 defining 131:25 132:17 definition 190:10 demand 19:10 38:14,24 39:24 40:18 41:15,21 54:14,20 55:15 demanded 15:24 16:2 19:9 38:6,7,9,11 86:16 137:14 138:5 demanding 39:17, 18 denying 52:10 department 78:23 depending 75:7 deposed 5:17 deposited 105:17 deposition 5:13 6:8 7:10,24 8:4,18 9:25 10:8,21 11:12 13:17, 20 14:2 15:3,14 28:24 29:10 37:4 60:6 82:21 83:25	84:11 115:23 173:2 186:21 187:18 192:7 depositions 12:2 40:19 41:12 61:6 140:20 172:20 175:7 182:9,24 183:9 184:17 185:14 186:19 187:14 190:2 194:21 196:3,11 derived 95:8 describe 19:16 111:2 164:17 describes 133:15 description 123:6 desk 160:18 detail 196:11 detailed 134:15 details 14:6 111:6 113:11 141:5 172:18, 19 175:7 180:2 181:22 182:25 determination 67:10 129:10 131:10, 22 132:7 138:9,14 154:16 155:19 156:21 157:2,9 170:18 determinations 127:23 130:6 determine 57:17 67:19 68:16 79:6 105:11,16 107:2 113:25 114:6,11 115:4 116:9 164:18 176:10 determined 57:25 129:4,13,23 130:9 131:17 136:7,13 154:19 156:14,18 determining 129:25 130:22 development 19:22 68:6,14 devoted 99:8 101:9 dictates 67:22 difference 8:11
--	---	---	--	---

Index: differently..entire

differently 155:7	disputed 40:14	193:12	136:1 137:1 138:1	99:23,25 100:10,13,
diligence 142:9 165:3	distinguishing 47:22	Dondero's 192:5 193:5 194:7	139:1 140:1 141:1	24 101:8 190:2,3
direct 26:5	distribution 19:20 20:4 107:16	doubt 77:2 80:12 98:4	142:1 143:1 144:1	195:18
direction 31:18	Docket 9:19	draft 69:4 72:7 96:2	145:1 146:1 147:1	emailed 84:2
directly 95:14 144:23	document 6:25 7:16 9:18,20 23:6 29:16	drafted 126:8 185:6 186:5	148:1 149:1 150:1	emails 11:22 189:18 190:12,13 196:7
director 26:25 27:4	35:7,22 37:10 38:13	drafting 77:4	151:1 152:1 153:1	employ 165:13 176:25
directors 23:2 26:24 88:4	46:19 47:16 50:25	due 65:24 70:16	154:1 155:1 156:1	employed 18:6 32:5, 6 83:9 166:24
disagree 148:10	71:4,24 87:16,21	78:12 79:21 81:5	157:1 158:1 159:1,15	employee 20:3 31:13 33:9,17 43:15
disciplinary 121:20, 25 122:6	104:5 119:13 120:7, 12 122:11,19,23	90:21 93:4 96:7	160:1 161:1 162:1	44:7,14 71:13 72:12
disclosed 49:23 64:17	126:5,12,17,21	101:19 102:3 153:22	163:1,12 164:1,9	75:2 76:9 77:17 80:6, 17 81:21 115:13
disclosure 86:12	128:20 138:21 140:8	165:3 173:10	165:1 166:1 167:1	119:25 120:2 121:6, 14,21 122:16 125:13, 18 126:4
discover 17:8	158:2,15 160:13	duly 5:3,5	168:1 169:1 170:1	employees 23:2 27:5,6,7,9,14 32:17, 22 41:6 42:18,21
discovered 54:11 63:12 175:8 194:2	161:18 166:10 183:7	Dustin 5:4 6:1 7:1	171:1 172:1 173:1	53:15 61:23 69:3
discovery 11:25 81:7 172:11 183:9	186:10,23 187:22	8:1,2,3 9:1 10:1 11:1	174:1 175:1 176:1	75:21 76:18 77:13
187:9 190:21 194:2	188:15 189:10,21	12:1 13:1 14:1 15:1	177:1 178:1 179:1	111:7,8 112:23
discuss 16:16 169:6 173:6	190:7,14,17	16:1,20 17:1 18:1	180:1 181:1 182:1	115:17 117:20,21,22
discussed 13:25 14:3,4,9 16:21,23	documentation 187:7 189:20	19:1 20:1 21:1 22:1	183:1 184:1 185:1	118:10 119:23
82:22 83:3 103:15	documented 61:7	23:1 24:1,9,17,21	186:1 187:1 188:1	123:15 124:5 125:5, 7,8 129:10,12 130:7
108:19 120:25	documents 6:22	25:1,3,10 26:1 27:1	189:1 190:1 191:1	135:15,21 137:10
135:19,20 140:17	8:17,20 9:14 11:16, 22,24 36:11 38:15	28:1 29:1 30:1 31:1	192:1 193:1 194:1	142:22 144:24 146:9, 11 150:11 156:11
142:3 166:25 174:6	62:18 136:22 144:15	32:1 33:1 34:1 35:1	195:1 196:1	161:9 166:24 170:13
181:14 196:10	145:10,11 156:23	36:1 37:1 38:1 39:1	duty 44:22	171:6,10 177:8 179:25
discussing 130:5 173:20	168:3 186:25 187:8, 17,20,21 188:18	40:1 41:1 42:1 43:1	earlier 13:12 16:13 22:24 65:8 86:21	enable 122:23
discussion 7:13 16:6 82:8 105:24	189:11,15,16 190:13	44:1 45:1 46:1 47:1	108:19 155:12	encourage 133:13
142:17 154:21	dollar 48:25 49:3 192:18	48:1 49:1 50:1 51:1	180:16	end 145:3,6 175:4 178:9,22
discussions 13:23 14:10 16:11 17:6,12, 14 110:2 118:8,11	dollars 14:8 157:13 193:2,4	52:1 53:1 54:1 55:1	earliest 81:4	ended 120:20,22 178:22
dishonest 194:13	Dondero 11:20 12:20 13:20 14:2,23	56:1 57:1 58:1 59:1	early 17:5 19:10 88:10 136:14 175:3 179:3	ending 46:11,25 47:18 86:24 95:15,23 154:14
dispute 49:20,25 50:4,17,20 92:15	15:20 26:7,9,14,15	60:1 61:1 62:1 63:1	economies 68:8	engagement 111:21
93:19 94:18,21	27:4 30:18,24 34:6	64:1 65:1 66:1 67:1	educate 127:12	entering 138:12
111:25 128:22 133:2	39:20 60:4,5,7,8,12	68:1 69:1 70:1 71:1	effect 122:3 139:2 174:10	entire 120:24 121:3 162:15 175:13 178:12 182:5
162:16 191:18,20,21	76:24 83:20 84:14, 22,25 98:18 99:18	72:1 73:1 74:1 75:1	effective 23:25 24:11 25:15	
	103:16 105:22	76:1 77:1 78:1 79:1	effectuated 170:19	
	106:13 121:3,14	80:1 81:1 82:1 83:1	effort 145:7 151:21	
	137:17 138:3,19	84:1 85:1 86:1 87:1	efforts 144:9	
	140:12,18,19 165:22	88:1 89:1 90:1 91:1	elaborated 84:13	
	166:3,11 167:2,3,5	92:1 93:1 94:1 95:1	Ellington 179:13,14	
	170:18 171:2,10,21	96:1 97:1 98:1 99:1	email 73:14 74:2 81:2 87:8 88:6 91:15 92:3, 4,17 93:20 94:23 96:17 97:24 98:8	
	172:12 178:6,17	100:1 101:1 102:1		
	180:18,25 182:11,13, 14 185:15 192:3,7,19	103:1 104:1 105:1		
		106:1 107:1 108:1		
		109:1 110:1 111:1		
		112:1 113:1 114:1		
		115:1 116:1 117:1		
		118:1 119:1 120:1		
		121:1 122:1 123:1		
		124:1 125:1 126:1		
		127:1 128:1 129:1		
		130:1 131:1 132:1		
		133:1 134:1 135:1		

entities 74:4,6,8 83:19 98:17,25 entitled 147:13 149:18,24 entity 26:13 27:3 52:9 73:25 75:13 77:18 111:25 193:4 entries 57:2 environment 130:9 equity 26:20 error 9:10 14:20,21 15:11 16:8,9,10 17:24 32:10,13,18,21 50:6 59:11,12 62:11 108:21 109:23 110:3, 6 115:16 117:13 118:6,10,16 119:20 120:9,15,25 121:15, 22 122:21,25 124:16, 22,25 125:16 126:11, 25 131:13,25 132:7, 14,16,17,19 133:16 134:7 135:3,12 136:11,13,16 137:4, 7,18 140:15,17 142:13,15,21 146:24 147:10,25 149:5,6,19 150:5,21 153:10,16 154:4,12,16,20,23 155:4 156:14,22 157:3,10,12 168:10, 22 169:3,17 170:3, 10,20,23 171:5,20 184:7 185:4,19 errors 126:16,20 131:24 132:16 137:14 186:14 estate 178:15 estimate 20:19 109:12 estimated 146:12 147:3 149:4,6,23 156:18 estimates 111:12 ethical 174:18 event 55:3,5,6 events 16:8 48:11,18 49:5,16	everybody's 33:16 evidence 184:17 exact 6:13 21:19 30:6 33:18 38:12 89:12 92:24 96:8 99:3 107:6 109:8,15 EXAMINATION 5:6 examined 6:10 examining 36:24 Excellent 9:22 102:24 exception 178:25 exchange 87:8 exclusively 25:20 99:8 132:11 executive 18:13 19:3,6,18 20:2,7 21:5,11,17 22:10 24:8,13,16,21 25:4, 11 43:4 73:25 74:5,7 97:4 116:5 exhibit 7:12,15,19 29:10,13 38:17,21,23 46:20,21 51:2,3 71:21,22 87:13,14 89:17,21 119:9,10 124:13 152:14,15 158:3,8 exhibits 9:15 11:18 87:10 89:17 161:22 196:10 existence 14:24 15:20 16:5 19:7 38:4 39:11 40:5,14 42:24 49:23 55:21 66:22 70:25 71:8 expect 44:15 63:9 127:6,13 expedited 152:4 expenses 106:20 expert 64:4 128:17 expertise 126:10 explain 122:24 193:6 explaining 165:9 extend 104:7	extensive 81:3 88:11 118:11 extensively 118:8 extent 16:20 80:25 81:11 extremely 151:25 <hr/> F <hr/> fact 29:7 55:15 66:21 109:3 131:15 133:4 149:22 182:4 191:22 factor 135:23 factors 67:21 131:18 132:11,13 facts 16:9 17:16 57:17 63:19 86:14 142:7,8 166:22 167:18 168:4 185:11 factual 16:21 85:16 138:11 fair 6:16 16:22,24 20:16 21:4,23 22:13, 20 25:19 34:2 37:5,6 39:10 40:3 49:19 66:22 73:22,23 89:23 90:5 109:6,22 112:21 115:5 129:6,25 131:16,23 132:8,9 133:5,12,14 141:8 145:4 147:4 153:25 154:7,11 155:8 157:7,11 160:14 164:19 167:9,21 168:7,15,17 179:3 181:19 195:7 fairly 91:21 112:5 faith 50:7 83:19 84:24 98:17 99:2,17 fall 31:25 32:2 67:8 familiar 110:19 118:20 164:13 familiarize 141:22, 25 fault 62:24 116:10 119:25 137:12 150:8 February 24:5,6,11,	15 25:3,9 105:10 134:6 136:17,23 137:3,7 140:21 141:15 145:4,6 146:18 151:5 178:9, 23 fee 103:9,15,19,23,24 104:3,8,11,19 105:2, 5,10,20,21 106:6,8, 22 107:2,4,5 108:13, 24 109:5,9,12 feel 20:20 29:15 fees 67:23 68:4 103:5 104:12,14,22 106:20, 22 107:9,18 field 83:9 figure 84:9 94:5 95:20 96:9 file 142:19 172:22 filed 9:13,18 28:12 29:3,19 34:4,5 35:8 37:11 39:25 54:18 142:25 144:10 145:21,24 149:10 151:8,13 159:22,24 161:7,24,25 162:2 163:25 164:2,5 166:19,20 173:4,6,25 176:2,6,9,13,17,24 177:17 183:7,17 187:2 filing 27:24 29:24 143:3,5,8,12 162:23 166:15 167:5 filings 189:22 filled 146:9 final 96:3,6,10,11,12 100:2 107:15 finalization 87:9 finalized 105:9 154:19 finance 43:12 70:6 75:9,16 financed 146:17 financial 43:5,10,13 44:2,24 45:3,5,8,19 46:10,24 47:13,17 48:15,19 49:21 50:2	57:22 58:13,16 64:5, 14,17 65:10 66:3 86:23 95:15,22 101:14,18 financials 43:20 44:16 47:24 48:2 55:3 94:24 95:2,9,17 154:14 find 56:6 116:25 117:6 144:14,19 183:9 fine 21:3 115:24 167:25 finish 194:25 fired 121:7 161:12 firing 121:18,23,25 firm 66:3 68:6 110:19 firmed 172:18 five-month 162:3 focus 23:12 53:9 130:24 focusing 12:12 folks 179:17 follow-up 88:9,12 99:9 footnotes 102:2 forbidden 174:17 forgive 8:23 107:17 form 42:16 61:3,17 70:18 168:22 formal 72:10 formed 145:25 156:4 161:13 167:19 forms 187:2 formulating 94:19 forwarded 89:24 90:3 forwards 88:19,21 90:11 found 15:15 54:20 63:13 81:6 86:20 92:20 93:22 153:15 155:3
--	--	--	---	---

Index: fourth..Highland

fourth 141:12 frame 166:15 Frank 12:3,23 14:10 15:5,8 24:9,16,21 25:4,11 39:13,15 43:15,17,24 44:22 45:17 60:6 65:16,17 71:13 75:9,11,12,15, 24 78:21 80:14,22 81:25 82:24 83:23 84:10,12 90:18 95:4 137:17 140:18 142:23 144:25 151:19 161:16 167:8 171:8 174:16 183:10, 19 185:15,18,19 186:10 187:11 193:14 194:3,17 195:9 196:12 Frank's 85:2 free 20:20 29:15 front 8:18 10:14 23:6 158:16 166:7 front-office 27:7,11, 14 69:21 full 30:15,18,20 83:19 84:24 98:17 99:2,17 162:11 function 63:10 65:3 68:14 72:6 74:19,24 75:20 76:4,16 77:20, 25 functions 27:15 31:15 41:3 43:13 68:19 69:20 70:7,9 75:17 fund 5:19,22 105:3,4, 7,25 106:2,8,11,18, 19 108:5,12 118:22, 23,25 119:2,3 122:24 123:2 125:22 131:24 fund's 107:19 funded 134:2 140:22 141:15 funds 19:13,19,23 21:12,18,24 22:11,19 33:14 66:7,22,24 67:4 68:2,8,9 69:23, 25 75:6,17 122:20	153:19 171:25 172:15,16 177:23 183:3 future 56:7 68:10 78:12 90:21 93:4 <hr/> G <hr/> GAF 126:7,13 127:6 128:12,15,23 129:2, 20,21 132:6 gain 148:9 game 16:22,24 gap 155:17 Gates 123:20 gave 35:17 47:14 72:3 general 12:6,7 14:3, 14 17:16,23 26:11, 12,15 27:2 111:16 133:14 generally 6:5 17:13 26:7 27:12 103:24 104:2 109:21 111:5 112:7 give 6:25 20:19 94:8 113:21 global 105:3 106:8 118:21 122:24 123:2 125:22 good 5:8 50:7 102:19 165:8 183:25 194:12 grab 160:16 granted 160:3 grants 160:8 group 11:23 43:19 190:4 194:18 195:11 growing 68:10 guess 14:8 36:19,20 41:8 64:6 guy 179:10 <hr/> H <hr/> H- 147:12	hail 152:9 half 153:18,23 162:6 192:18 193:2,4 hand 87:3 handed 40:21 happened 97:16 153:13 177:6 happy 47:20 56:9 hard 167:25 168:2 harm 147:22 148:22 HCMFA 5:22 6:4,7 9:3 10:7 18:9,12,16, 19,22 19:14 20:15, 21,25 23:3 24:3 25:21 26:2,18,24 27:2,6,13,22 28:9 29:3,20 30:12,15,18 34:4,5,16,22 35:8,24 37:5,11,15,20 38:3 39:8,10,23 40:4,8 41:7 42:4,14,19,23 43:4,8,14,25 44:8,14, 23 45:15,18 47:12 49:9,20 50:17,20 51:18,23 52:23 53:12,20 54:6,10,24 55:14,23 56:20 57:8 58:3 59:4,8,14 62:6 64:16,22 65:5,13,17 66:3,19 68:20 69:13, 15 70:14,15,24 71:7 75:2,23 76:2,5,9 77:25 78:13,17 80:5, 7,17 81:5,22 85:17 86:22 93:5,19 94:16 95:5 104:12 106:6,7, 19 108:3,12 109:21 110:8,17 111:25 112:24 113:3,7,14, 21,24 114:5,10 115:2,12 116:8 117:11,12 118:3,4,5, 14,15,21 119:14 120:8 121:4 122:23 123:11,20 124:19 125:14,18 126:23 127:3,5,6 129:2,3,20, 21,22 132:5,20,25 134:5,12,17,18,23 135:5,11 136:6 137:2,6,13,20,24 138:4,16,17,24	140:14 142:11,12,19 143:4,6,8,11,12,15, 17,19,22 144:10,21 145:3,7,15,24 146:5 147:12,23 149:8,10, 23 150:3,7,20 151:9 153:10 154:2,11 155:8,15,16,21,24 156:17 157:11,16 158:11 161:19 162:16 163:24 164:2, 6 165:12 166:24 167:15 168:20 169:24,25 170:2 172:9,14 173:24 174:25 176:13 177:14,25 180:10,23 181:6,18 186:15 188:15 191:18,19,21, 23 192:16,23 193:7, 15 194:16 195:9,22 HCMFA's 15:18 23:14 26:4 30:23 31:4,8 33:4 36:18 38:5 42:3 43:5,9 44:2,21,23 45:4,19 46:10,24 47:12,17 48:7,14 49:14 52:2 54:22 55:12,20 58:15 59:17 60:11,24 61:13,15 63:3,22 64:15,21 65:6,15 66:16,21 67:11 69:9, 21 79:5 82:10,14 85:7 92:15,20 93:22 95:8,11,14,18,21 101:13 102:5 114:18 127:9 132:4 146:20 147:5 149:17 158:25 159:7 168:18 170:25 176:18 177:3 182:4 183:18 186:22 190:6 193:8 HCMLP 5:25 9:2 13:10 31:13 32:17, 22,24,25 40:11 41:4 43:14 44:13 52:11 53:15,19,20 54:9 60:12 63:10 65:3,18 68:25 69:2,7 70:3 71:11,12 72:5,12 75:10,12,19,21 76:17 77:13,17,23 78:12, 16,23 81:4 90:24 93:4 96:8 102:3	110:17 111:7,11,12, 15 112:22 115:14 117:21 120:2 121:16 125:5,7,8 129:8,12 130:7,9 131:6 135:15,18,21,23 137:24 142:22 145:3 150:11 156:11,15 161:9,13 166:24 170:5,12 177:23 178:18 186:16 HCMLP's 52:3,4 119:23 121:17 144:15,24 181:3 head 19:20 20:4 hearing 40:20 hearings 40:20 held 21:15 27:13 105:7,13 helped 72:13 helpful 38:14 53:3 189:24 196:16 helps 68:8 Hendrix 12:4 79:16 90:13 183:5 187:10 194:3 Hey 82:5 86:9 94:4 102:14 177:19 Highland 5:12,18,21, 24,25 6:7 27:17 28:8 29:3 31:12 32:6 40:4, 13 42:20 44:7 45:7, 14 48:22 49:11 50:18 51:17,25 52:5 54:25 56:23 59:11,15 60:9 61:22 62:16 64:23 65:25 70:15 71:14 75:15 79:22 90:22 96:25 97:7,11,13 108:20 111:8 114:19 115:15 119:14 120:8, 9 121:4,7,21,22 123:15,23 124:4,8,20 125:14,22 131:3 134:18 135:12 136:7 137:8,10,14,21 138:5,15 140:14 146:2,6,8,21 147:6, 14 149:9,19 150:5,8, 21 155:19,22,24
---	--	--	--	--

156:5 157:17 161:5, 20 162:17 163:22 165:13,15 168:9,20 169:20 171:3,4,9 172:13,22 173:3,6, 12,25 175:3 176:15, 20,25 177:16 179:11 180:3 195:12 Highland's 96:21 115:8 123:21 126:9 134:25 135:7 138:6, 17,22 140:8 168:11, 21 178:7 179:2 highly 77:2 hire 68:3 hired 75:19 122:4 hiring 121:17 hitting 148:8 hold 18:8 139:17,21 host 62:18 186:20 Houlihan 110:8,11, 13,16,20 111:3,13, 18,22 112:2,4,8,11, 15,19,24 113:3,8,15, 20,25 114:6,12,15,22 115:4,12,21 116:9,24 117:5,12,20 118:5,9, 14,15 127:24 128:5, 8,16 129:3,13,22 130:16 132:22 133:2 hour 102:23 house 152:9 huge 70:4	26:4 76:9 121:6,11, 13 124:7 144:9 188:15 189:10,23 190:14 identity 23:2 25:25 81:18 imagine 137:22 148:15 impact 68:8 important 33:6 66:18 69:12,18 177:11 190:22 imposed 121:20 177:3 improvement 122:3 in-depth 135:20 in-person 99:6 inaccurate 73:4 86:8,11 130:11 132:21 include 98:16,24 115:21 included 50:2,7 71:12 84:15,19 85:18 95:20 101:18 169:4 196:9 includes 43:13 79:7, 20 82:12,16 88:22 128:8 including 23:17 27:24 88:20 102:7 133:18 income 59:21 63:22 64:9 incorrect 53:18 80:12 86:19 97:24 incumbency 9:7 19:2 20:13 23:22 25:20 independent 88:3,4 112:5 128:16 independently 80:18 166:9 indirect 26:5,8 individual 111:6 115:11 147:21	individuals 31:19 80:10 179:20 187:14 196:4 inflow 63:23 inflows 68:7 inform 84:23 125:14 information 25:24 33:25 34:11 54:15 62:14 75:19 78:22 80:7,24 82:2,3 83:2,8 91:3 94:8,24 95:6,12 98:6 115:13,22 117:6 145:7,16 167:7 181:12 183:10 184:2 informed 70:14,24 92:16 118:4 150:4,20 informing 71:7 inhibited 175:9 inimical 31:20 41:5 initial 40:18 127:23 161:8 initially 129:4,23 131:17 injunction 40:21 179:24 inputs 111:11 112:23 insight 68:5 instance 192:20 instructed 14:11 instructing 190:4 instructions 13:18 insurance 134:14 136:24 140:23 141:16,20,23 142:2, 4,12,19,24 143:2,13, 16,23 144:21 145:8, 16,25 146:5,17 147:7,14,20 148:5,6, 7,8,13,21 149:10 151:5,9,12,25 152:11 171:24 172:16,22 173:4,7,25 intend 127:5 intended 61:16 62:8 63:22 168:10,20	intent 15:10 intention 127:8,9 intentionally 75:19 interacted 32:16 125:4 interacting 145:2 interest 26:21 33:16 interject 82:6 144:11,12 internal 166:21 internally 11:22 135:20 interpretations 111:13 interrupt 69:5 139:11 intra-year 57:23 investigation 16:12, 17 17:18 114:6,11 115:3 116:7 124:10, 17 161:3 164:17,21 165:2,10,11,14,18,21 166:3,11 167:11,17 176:10 178:4 180:12, 19,23 181:5 investment 27:11 69:22 70:2 105:8 investors 105:5,12 106:3,9 invoice 59:14 60:17 involved 18:2,19 29:24 32:12,20 69:16 72:15,20 77:3 83:8 86:17 105:23 106:14, 16 110:11 111:6,9 115:18 120:2 121:15 123:13,16 126:11 171:7 177:21 involvement 114:16 123:14 involving 110:6 irony 39:16 119:21 Isaac 179:8,12,25 issue 49:23 59:14 81:10 100:17 109:19	112:21 114:20 123:11 issued 49:6 issues 32:12 118:22 124:9 155:10,16,18 156:2,4,9 items 8:24 91:21 169:3 181:2 187:13 <hr/> J <hr/> James 167:2 January 19:4 20:17 23:14,20 24:4 25:21 26:2,5 28:12 34:3,24 39:25 40:17 49:10 153:3 154:18 161:21 162:13 163:23 176:14 January-ish 19:11 Jason 11:20 12:20 16:7 33:6,7,20 34:9 Jim 26:7,9 27:4 40:21 60:12 76:24 83:20 98:18 105:22 106:13 121:3 170:18,25 171:10,21 179:24 180:25 185:15,18 192:19 193:5 job 165:8 John 5:9 8:2 56:5 82:5 102:14 115:19 117:6 139:13,17,21, 25 174:11 195:4 join 69:22 Jones 5:10 JPEG 183:6 187:11, 17,20,21 188:17 189:11,15 190:13 July 161:24 162:14 164:2 175:4 176:2,3, 7 177:17 June 42:25 43:2 47:7 49:10,22 86:24 87:6 95:9,16,23 96:8 101:14 102:6 107:10, 12 154:8,14
--	--	---	--	--

<p>K</p> <p>K&I 123:20</p> <p>key 17:22 43:11 111:11,12 131:14 155:11</p> <p>kind 36:7 59:15 60:16 117:14 140:8 189:23</p> <p>Klos 12:3 79:15 80:14 90:12,19 171:8 183:2,3 185:15,20 186:3 190:3 194:3 196:11</p> <p>knew 39:11 42:14,18 130:7,20 131:5 137:2,6 156:3,7 194:17 195:10,13</p> <p>Knowing 84:12</p> <p>knowledge 17:7,8, 11 26:22 32:9 34:21, 25 35:4 36:20,21,22 40:10 42:19,24 46:5 56:20 57:9,13,20 63:16 64:8 71:7 73:5, 8 77:3 85:6,19 98:18 100:17,20,23 101:4 103:19 114:9 115:3 116:6 119:22 121:17 124:11 150:18,19,22 152:6,10 156:15 166:23,25 172:23 173:7 180:20</p> <p>knowledgeable 32:14</p> <p>Kristen 80:15</p> <p>Kristin 12:4 90:19 95:4 183:4,5 185:15, 21,23 187:10 190:4 194:3 196:12</p>	<p>large 68:25 192:19</p> <p>largely 61:21 66:23</p> <p>lasted 154:25</p> <p>late 32:2 33:18 97:20 145:23 151:14</p> <p>latest 63:11</p> <p>launching 177:21</p> <p>Lauren 24:22 25:6 71:12 72:11 75:5 76:8 77:15 88:15,19 90:25 94:4</p> <p>law 67:21 147:19 148:20</p> <p>lawsuit 28:14,18 40:9 49:17 64:18,24 86:17 144:8 161:21</p> <p>lawsuits 40:23</p> <p>lawyer 94:13 148:17</p> <p>lead 19:21 94:19</p> <p>leading 40:17 53:4</p> <p>learn 19:7 38:3 55:14 142:8</p> <p>learned 14:24 15:20 16:4 38:5 55:20 153:10 154:2,12 155:9,16 156:2 167:17</p> <p>learning 17:17 55:24 155:18</p> <p>lease 34:14</p> <p>leave 9:11 33:7,9 164:7</p> <p>ledger 58:4,8,9</p> <p>left 33:22 165:13 175:3 176:20,25 177:5,16 179:21</p>	<p>legal/compliance 76:19</p> <p>letter 38:24 39:24 40:8 41:15 42:4 55:15 85:23 111:22</p> <p>Leventon 179:8</p> <p>liabilities 54:24 55:25 56:23 57:10, 11,14,21 58:7,18 59:2,20 64:24 71:14 102:6,8 193:20</p> <p>liability 54:9,12 55:8, 9,13 58:21,22 63:14, 15 193:9</p> <p>lift 175:13</p> <p>limitation 31:3,8 34:22 176:18 177:2</p> <p>limitations 33:4</p> <p>limited 16:12,15 33:22</p> <p>limiting 45:14</p> <p>lines 52:6 141:13 146:25</p> <p>lineup 24:19</p> <p>list 29:6 88:11</p> <p>listen 62:5 120:5 129:18 171:16</p> <p>listening 41:25</p> <p>litigation 16:24 41:10 179:10</p> <p>litigators 178:13</p> <p>loan 15:6,8,9 59:10 60:8 61:17 62:9 63:7 104:6 134:19,24 168:23 195:20</p> <p>loans 61:3 194:19 195:12,24</p> <p>logic 148:4</p> <p>Lokey 110:9,11,13, 16,20 111:3,18,22 112:2,4,8,15,19,24 113:3,8,15,20,25 114:7,12,23 115:4, 12,21 116:9,24 117:5,12,21 118:5,6, 9,14,15 127:24</p>	<p>128:5,8,9,16 129:3, 13,22 130:16 132:23 133:2</p> <p>Lokey's 112:11 114:16</p> <p>long 64:4 73:18 148:13</p> <p>longer 24:18,23,25 25:7 83:9 178:19</p> <p>looked 80:25 89:9 116:23 139:5 163:8</p> <p>loss 133:15,21 134:2 146:12 147:2,3,15 148:6 149:4,6,23 156:18 157:12</p> <p>lot 36:11 40:19,24 62:13 69:20 106:16 109:25 110:2 123:13, 14,16 130:15,18 154:21 175:10,15 177:21 190:20 196:4, 19</p> <p>love 117:3</p> <p>lower 51:20</p> <p>LP 5:12,19,22,25 19:25 20:7 21:2 27:18 32:7 42:21 61:22 123:15 124:21 125:15 131:3 146:2 169:20 171:3,5</p>	<p>maintain 58:3</p> <p>make 10:12 43:25 44:23 45:22 74:16 75:2 76:2,10 80:7,18 83:5 134:13 137:17 138:2 149:2 152:7 163:18 185:22 186:4 187:15 194:14</p> <p>maker 186:6,9,11,12</p> <p>makes 37:2</p> <p>making 45:19 65:14 81:19,23 122:17 125:19 126:5 155:18</p> <p>manage 67:3</p> <p>managed 19:13 21:24 22:11,19 66:24 69:2 142:24</p> <p>management 5:12, 19,22,25 27:17 32:7 42:21 52:6 61:22 69:25 105:22 106:13 123:15 124:21 125:15 131:3 146:2,6 169:20 171:3,5 178:5 180:22</p> <p>managers 27:12</p> <p>manages 21:13</p> <p>mandated 108:10</p> <p>March 29:20 30:3,7, 9,16,19 31:5,9 33:5 34:4,24 35:6 61:11, 14 126:22 129:4,14, 23 153:2,13 166:19 167:4 175:3,11 177:5,6 188:17 189:13 190:15</p>
<p>L</p> <p>La 158:5</p> <p>lack 184:22 191:15</p> <p>lacked 186:2,3 192:2</p> <p>lady 174:13</p> <p>laid 135:10</p>	<p>legal 27:17 31:13,15, 19 32:24 41:2,7 61:23 69:3 70:5 72:6, 14 74:19,22 76:14,15 77:23,24 83:9 106:13 126:9 138:9,13 144:15 170:14 178:8, 10,12,20 179:2 180:3 181:2</p>		<p>M</p> <p>Mabry 25:12 167:8</p> <p>made 27:23 35:24 36:7 37:16,23 56:22 59:11 60:12 61:2 64:23 105:19 106:17 113:4,8,15,25 114:7 117:13 118:6,15 121:8 127:16,23 129:10 137:15 138:10 143:5,6,25 144:8 145:7 151:21 164:6 167:5 183:23 184:12 194:4,13</p> <p>magic 56:8</p> <p>magnitude 152:3</p>	<p>Mark 26:8,10 106:14</p> <p>marked 7:12 46:19 50:25 119:9 124:13 125:20 158:3</p> <p>market 130:22 153:12</p> <p>marketing 19:22</p> <p>match 82:25</p> <p>material 75:7 90:20 93:3</p>

Index: materials..norris

materials 9:20 46:13 92:12 146:9	midyear 153:19	morning 5:8 56:8	moved 180:15	Nexpoint 18:7 19:13, 24 20:7,23,25 33:9, 17 74:10 78:13		
matter 62:25 85:17 121:16 133:15 173:21	migrated 179:2,5,15	Morris 5:7,9 7:8,14, 18,22 8:9 10:11,15 17:2 18:5 29:9,14 38:17,22 42:10,13,22 44:17,19 45:10,12 46:18,22 47:3,5 48:10,13 50:12,16,24 51:4,9,12 52:13,15 53:22,24 56:9,13,17, 19 60:19,21 62:2,4, 20,22 70:22 71:20,23 72:16,18 73:18,20 76:22,23 78:3,5,24 79:4 81:14,16 82:9 83:11,12 86:2,5 87:12,15,20,22 88:16,18 90:8,10 91:5,7,22,24 93:12, 14 96:16,18 102:17, 21 103:3 116:3,11, 16,18 117:8,10,24 118:2,12,13 119:8,11 120:3,4 125:9,12 129:15,17 131:7,9 133:8,10 135:24 136:2 139:14,18,23 140:5,6 141:9,11 142:18 144:20 150:14,16,23 151:3 152:12,18,22,23 157:25 158:7,9,21,24 159:18 163:14,17 164:12 169:11,14 171:13,15 172:8 173:22 174:19,23,24 175:21,24 177:12,13 183:13,16 184:18,20 190:24 191:7,9 192:10,14 195:6,8 196:14,19	multiple 13:21 31:23 99:10	N	night 139:16 183:18	non-orderly 129:5, 14,24 130:6,10,23 131:11
matters 16:22 124:3	million 14:7 48:21 50:18,21 51:18,21 63:24 79:7 82:11,12, 15,16 83:14 107:7 108:13 109:4,5,7,13, 14 133:17,23 134:6, 17,22,24 135:5 138:6,16,23 140:9,22 143:19 146:13,21 147:2,6,7,9,13,15,24 148:9,12 149:5,13, 16,18,23,25 150:4 156:19 157:13,15 168:10,19 192:18,22 193:2,4	move 44:17 45:11 50:12 53:23 60:19 62:2,20 70:12 72:17 76:22 78:24 81:14 83:11 89:22 91:22 108:4 117:25 118:12 120:3 125:9 129:15 131:7 135:24 150:14 171:14 177:12 183:13 184:18 190:24 192:11	mutual 142:13,20 144:23 145:2,8,15 149:11,13 150:4,7,20 185:8,12,16 186:24 187:24 188:10,14,21 189:12 190:8,16	norris 5:4,8 6:1 7:1, 12,21 8:1 9:1 10:1,14 11:1 12:1 13:1 14:1 15:1 16:1 17:1 18:1 19:1 20:1 21:1 22:1 23:1 24:1,9,17,21 25:1,3,11 26:1 27:1 28:1 29:1 30:1 31:1 32:1 33:1 34:1 35:1 36:1 37:1 38:1 39:1 40:1 41:1 42:1 43:1 44:1 45:1 46:1 47:1 48:1 49:1 50:1 51:1 52:1 53:1 54:1 55:1 56:1 57:1 58:1 59:1 60:1 61:1 62:1 63:1 64:1 65:1 66:1 67:1 68:1 69:1 70:1 71:1 72:1 73:1 74:1 75:1 76:1 77:1 78:1 79:1 80:1 81:1 82:1 83:1 84:1 85:1 86:1 87:1 88:1 89:1 90:1 91:1 92:1 93:1,15 94:1 95:1 96:1 97:1 98:1 99:1 100:1 101:1 102:1 103:1,4 104:1 105:1 106:1 107:1 108:1 109:1 110:1 111:1 112:1 113:1 114:1 115:1 116:1, 12,19 117:1 118:1 119:1 120:1 121:1 122:1 123:1 124:1 125:1 126:1 127:1 128:1 129:1 130:1 131:1 132:1 133:1 134:1 135:1 136:1 137:1 138:1 139:1 140:1 141:1 142:1 143:1 144:1 145:1 146:1 147:1 148:1 149:1 150:1 151:1 152:1,25 153:1 154:1 155:1 156:1 157:1 158:1 159:1 160:1 161:1 162:1 163:1		
Mckenzie 174:14	mine 68:13		named 65:17			
meaning 58:23 96:11	minute 82:7		names 23:17			
meaningful 193:3	minutes 109:19 191:4		naturally 32:22			
means 83:22 128:11 159:12	missing 25:17		nature 179:22 182:21 192:4,5 193:11,16			
meant 84:9,10 100:9, 14 159:20	mistake 117:13 118:6,15 182:7 183:20,23 184:12 185:8,12,17 186:24 187:24 188:10,14,22 189:12 190:8,16 193:10 194:14,15		NAV 9:10 14:20,21 15:11 16:8,9 17:24 32:10,13,17,21 59:12 62:11 108:21 115:15 119:20 120:9,15,25 121:15,21 122:25 124:16,21,24 125:16 126:11 131:13,24,25 132:6,14,15,16,17,19 133:16 134:7 135:3, 12 136:11,13,16 137:3,7,18 140:15,17 142:13,15,21 147:9, 25 149:4,6 150:5,21 153:5,10 154:3,12,16 155:4 156:14,22 157:3,10,12 168:9,22 169:3,17 170:3,9,20, 22 171:5,20 184:6 185:4,19			
measures 121:20	mistakenly 134:18 182:18		needed 13:16 105:16 106:5 177:19,22 192:20			
meeting 87:2 98:17, 22,25 99:4,5,6,7,16	mistakes 113:4,8,15 114:2,7 121:8 137:15 194:14		negligence 148:23, 25			
meetings 67:16 69:22 99:10,13,20	Mitts 25:5		negligent 135:2,7 136:7 138:7,17 146:23 168:11,21			
members 171:7	mixed 168:3		net 122:20 147:2 149:4,23			
memo 9:10 72:9,13, 24 73:4,9,14,16,19 74:9 75:3,14 76:14 77:5,19 78:19 86:10, 21 87:9 88:10 89:2 96:11 100:2 123:3 124:12 125:6 127:13 128:22 130:3,15,16, 24 156:24 157:20	model 112:18,20,25					
memorandum 125:19 126:25 127:3, 7,10	models 111:14					
memory 141:7	moment 23:12 117:9					
memos 32:19 62:11 69:4 74:21 76:6,19 77:4 96:12 119:4	money 60:9 108:22 134:12 137:23,24 140:13 172:13 185:18,21					
mentioned 131:19 132:12	moneys 109:4					
mergers 68:11	months 155:2 161:20 162:2,3,7,11 174:13 179:18					
met 11:18,19 12:4						
metadata 187:10 189:16						
methodology 131:23 132:8,9						
Michael 7:19						

164:1 165:1 166:1 167:1 168:1 169:1 170:1 171:1 172:1 173:1 174:1 175:1 176:1 177:1 178:1 179:1 180:1 181:1 182:1 183:1 184:1 185:1 186:1 187:1 188:1 189:1 190:1 191:1,10 192:1 193:1 194:1 195:1 196:1	52:16,21 57:6 63:2 67:20 78:10 79:7,19 82:16 83:14 85:9 86:8,19 89:8,9 90:20 92:19 93:22 95:8,14 96:7 98:9 102:3 103:4 104:18 109:8 119:4 123:7 141:19 142:10 146:14 148:9 152:15 163:2 184:10	offline 144:13 offsets 133:19 Okada 26:8,10 106:15 on-market 153:13 ongoing 118:8 open 9:18 106:11 open-end 105:4,7,25 106:18 operating 193:3 operational 105:11, 15 operative 159:7,12, 15,16 opinion 47:8,14,23 49:22 145:25 orally 124:20 order 6:25 40:22 56:21 138:16 orderly 130:23 131:11,22 132:7 original 8:22 9:2,3 29:4,7,11,19 34:5 38:20 93:9 113:13 162:19,22,23,24,25 163:4,7 166:13,15,19 168:5 originally 18:17 outflows 68:7 outsource 43:18 115:10 129:9 outsourced 27:16 31:14 32:23,24 41:4 43:12 61:22 63:10 65:3 119:23 129:12 135:18 137:11 170:15 outstanding 70:16 78:16 90:20 93:3 oversee 43:19 44:15 45:3 68:5 overseeing 135:16 171:8 overview 12:8 17:23	owed 71:14 owing 65:24 79:21 83:2 owned 26:14 owners 26:5,8 owns 26:11,19 <hr/> P <hr/> p.m. 92:18 93:18 103:2 151:2 191:8 196:21 Pachulski 5:10 pages 73:21 79:25 89:20 163:8 paid 103:19 104:3,4,8 105:5,15,16,17 106:6,8 107:5,9,10, 11,15,18,20 109:4,17 111:19 136:24 141:17 146:21 148:3, 4 149:13 paper 183:4 185:22 189:19 194:19 195:11 papered 182:22 195:20,24 papers 185:23 paragraph 127:20 128:2,4 132:21 133:7,15,25 152:25 160:14 169:12,16 173:3 175:19,22 181:6 184:21 185:8 188:6 191:12 Paragraphs 168:8, 16,17 Pardon 189:5 parenthetical 133:20 Parker 24:8,16,23 Parker's 24:12 part 31:12 32:25 34:18 61:5 67:24 69:2,3 70:4 72:3 77:21,23 85:13,15	87:2,10 92:11 122:9 127:25 129:8 142:24 150:11 165:18,21 166:11 176:21 178:11 195:25 participate 67:7,13, 15 99:15 participated 32:19 68:21 71:6 particulars 161:15 partner 26:11,12,16 106:15 partners 27:2 parts 67:14,15 83:14 168:13 party 68:3 115:5 125:2,15 146:3,7 148:22 149:9 155:17, 20,22,25 156:6,8 passed 71:11 path 185:16 patience 93:15 195:2 pay 70:15 104:12,14 105:19 108:23 109:4 134:5 137:24 138:5, 16,23 140:9 157:17 payable 53:19 54:9 58:3,8,9 73:15 78:12 90:21 93:4 101:19 paying 104:22 148:12 payment 51:23 63:5 108:12 134:13 140:22 141:15 151:5, 10 168:10 170:20 184:5 185:3,5 payments 52:24 53:13 54:6,11 55:24 56:22 57:5,10,11,20 58:14 59:9,19 61:2, 16 62:8 64:23 127:16,17 134:2,10, 24 135:6 137:18 PDF 89:18 pending 49:17 people 12:12,19 88:5,20 122:5 123:13
note 13:12 17:7,8 73:15 75:8 78:21 81:4 102:7 134:21 161:15 169:7,8,9 176:11 182:15,16,19, 23 183:4 186:4 190:5 192:4,18,22 notes 9:6 14:12,13, 24 15:15,21 16:5 17:9,11,24 19:8 27:23 28:9,13,17,20, 23,24 35:10 36:2,9 37:12,17,25 38:4 39:11 40:6,14 42:14, 18,24 48:18,20,22 49:6,8,11,15,17,23 50:5,9 58:7 64:17 70:16,25 71:8,9 79:8, 10,11,20 81:10 82:17 83:3,19 86:15,17 101:19,23,24 161:5, 19,22 162:17,22 163:6,21,24 164:19 165:15 166:22,25 167:2 176:14 181:8, 13,24 182:6,20 183:20,24 184:13 185:2,3,6,25 187:7 192:15 193:11,15,17, 18 notice 6:6 7:11,24 8:14,18 9:9,24 10:8, 21 11:9 22:25 32:18 37:4 141:20 noticed 193:8 notified 146:11 notwithstanding 55:13 149:8,22 nuance 95:3 number 7:15 9:14,17 27:19,21 29:6,8	numbers 82:25 96:4 <hr/> O <hr/> object 116:14 172:5 173:18 Objection 42:16 70:18 obligated 70:15,20 obligation 192:23 obtain 108:2 145:7 obtained 95:21 occasions 31:24 occur 193:16 occurred 120:16 October 70:14,24 72:3 73:24 78:15 84:23 92:18 93:18 95:6,13 97:14,16,23 98:10 100:2 October/november 97:20 off-market 153:12 offhand 156:25 office 70:6 officer 18:13,15,22, 23 20:3,10 21:5,24 22:18 24:23,25 32:15 33:13 39:16 45:18 65:5,13 74:25 76:9 80:6,17,23 81:21 122:16 125:13,18,24 126:4 191:19 officers 23:2,14 25:21 26:2 39:21 69:15			

Index: percent..question

179:2,5 194:12	pleadings 11:15 27:24 35:19 61:4 135:10 172:20 175:6 180:14 186:19,22,25 193:24,25 194:21 196:2,3	precise 109:11	157:13 167:6 179:11	provide 53:4 68:5 69:24 70:3 75:20 88:5 91:12 178:19
percent 26:11,14 80:19 105:5	plenty 187:3	preference 53:7	priority 40:25	provided 11:24 25:15 46:14 66:9 68:25 76:16,18 80:24 86:22 92:11 94:10 95:12 102:2 110:23 111:3,12,22 114:23 115:14 177:24
perform 27:9	plugging 96:5	preliminary 179:24	problem 168:14	provider 65:18 115:10 129:9 148:22
performance 67:23 68:2,4 69:23,25 138:7	point 22:6 61:25 68:24 80:2 115:7 154:17 158:11 175:5 187:25 188:23	premiums 148:5,6, 13,15	procedures 46:7	providing 68:17 70:7 77:21,24 146:22 178:19
performed 27:14 62:15 68:2 113:9	pointed 22:24	preparation 12:14 13:15 15:3 43:14,20 48:16 82:24 142:9 144:8 163:9 172:25	proceed 151:10	proxy 106:3
performing 170:14	points 172:6	prepare 11:11 36:14 43:19 72:13 103:11, 14 104:17 112:19 161:11	proceeding 28:8	publicly 183:18
period 18:2 24:7 27:18 31:14 40:16 43:23 46:11,25 47:18 86:24 95:15,22 105:18 107:8 121:3 153:2,6,8,12 154:14 156:3 161:9 162:15	policy 142:11,12,13	prepared 10:6 28:4 52:20 57:23 74:21 84:5 114:14,17 118:21 161:2,19	proceedings 5:1 99:11	pull 89:13 102:11 119:5 167:22
periods 22:4,5 54:19	portion 29:16 50:13 78:25 79:18 107:11 125:10 141:2 190:25	preparing 131:6 154:13 183:23 184:13	proceeds 134:14 136:24 140:23 141:16 146:17 148:11,13	pulling 96:4
permission 159:24 180:10	portions 6:24 131:14,16	present 13:22 22:7 23:15	process 17:25 32:21 62:18 63:13 67:13 69:2 71:6 76:20 87:2 99:8 111:17 122:2 123:9,10 154:25 157:19,21 160:10,11 171:9 183:8 185:23 194:2,4	purports 164:16
permit 147:19	posed 71:10 101:10	presentations 119:5	processed 152:2	purpose 14:6 25:23 101:9 122:23
permits 148:20	position 12:10 18:8, 11 20:10 21:6 38:5 53:3,18 54:13 55:12 59:18 60:25 61:15,24 62:8 64:21 85:7,12 86:15,20 97:7,11 101:21 113:7,14 139:9 140:2,3,7,16 142:4,6 143:10 147:5,16,18 148:19 149:17 170:25 179:19 181:6,10,13 182:4 183:19 186:9, 11,14,16 190:8 193:18 194:9,22	presented 89:25	processing 133:18	purposes 57:24 62:16 64:2,9 129:6, 25 146:22
permitted 148:19 161:10 174:3	positions 6:24 131:14,16	president 18:13 19:4,6,19 20:2,7 21:5,12,18 22:11 24:3,8,13,16,18,19, 21 25:4,11 43:4 60:12 73:25 74:5,7 97:4 116:5 170:19 171:2,10,21 173:12, 14,15,16	produced 117:2	pursuant 66:10 111:22 138:4
person 12:4 125:3 137:20,21	possession 162:17 163:24 176:14	presenting 131:6 154:13 183:23 184:13	product 19:20 20:4 96:3 112:14	put 7:9,15 29:9 38:17 40:24 41:9 46:18 50:24 71:20 87:12 119:8 152:13,19 157:25
personal 32:9 34:25 36:21 103:18 152:10	Post 11:20 12:20 16:4,7 32:4,5 33:5,7, 11,15 34:7,9,16,23 97:12	presently 123:11	professional 43:17 180:6	putting 6:22
personally 99:15	practice 121:23 182:19	pretty 123:11	professionals 27:8 41:7 43:18 69:22 80:13 194:12,14	<hr/> Q <hr/>
perspective 14:4	practices 121:18	previously 40:5 164:6	profited 147:24	quality 67:23 68:17
phrase 35:15 37:3,20 180:21	preceded 87:8	Pricewaterhouseco opers 47:7,11 49:22	profits 148:3	quarrel 162:5
picked 178:16		principal 66:15 70:16 79:7 82:17,25	prohibited 173:19	question 6:14,16,18 22:17,22 35:20 41:24 42:2 45:17 50:15 53:9,10 54:3,4 60:22 61:8 62:5 65:9 70:21 71:10 72:21 78:4,6,9 79:3 82:20 86:7,10 89:8,9 90:19 91:25
pinpoint 135:22		prior 22:15 31:4,9 33:5,22 34:12 35:8, 24 36:8 37:11,16,24 39:24 40:8 61:14,20 62:7 63:16 76:6 99:25 101:23 116:14 120:16 124:13 126:22 152:16	prohibition 174:10 176:18	
place 58:24 179:24			promise 55:21 138:11	
plaintiff 170:8,21 171:19,24 184:5			promissory 9:5 14:13 28:9,23 48:20 181:7	
plaintiff's 7:23 9:24			promptly 166:21	
play 70:9			proper 154:23	
pleading 30:13 35:14 159:7,12,15,17 181:11 182:17 193:25			proposal 106:5	

Index: questioned..responsible

92:19,24 93:10,18,22 94:10 95:8,14 100:6, 7 113:13 114:22 115:9,15 116:15,17 119:24 120:6 126:2 129:19 130:14 135:14 137:2,6 138:14 154:5 155:6 171:17 173:9 176:4 180:16 183:14 184:19 187:19 189:8 194:5,23 195:5	124:15 126:15 144:5 151:12,14 163:6	refer 5:21,24 13:14 17:19 20:25 28:22 30:9 31:16 54:16 60:3 61:18 63:11 67:3 83:24 84:2 85:5 119:6 164:22 172:19 181:11,20 184:16 186:18 188:19 192:8 193:24 194:20 195:15 196:2	relevant 167:18	119:14
questioned 99:23 115:16	receipts 147:8	reference 48:20 51:13 128:7,8 131:2 153:2 184:22 191:14	reliable 44:3	represented 134:10 172:12 175:10
questions 9:8 28:4 36:14,17 37:7,21 54:2 77:7 88:6,11,12, 23 89:3,25 101:10 139:15 142:10 155:4 191:10 196:15,18	receive 41:15 104:11 148:21 149:18	referenced 82:15 190:13	relied 43:21 44:12 80:20	representing 46:6 95:3 186:7
quick 46:17 152:6	received 38:8 39:14 42:5,8 50:17,20 52:10 80:10 108:22 143:19 146:18 147:5 149:17,24 150:4 151:5 166:13 187:9 194:7	referred 124:2	rely 44:5,6 112:24 127:6,13	request 33:10 81:24
quote 78:15 83:18,20 98:15 129:3,22 131:22 169:16 171:23 181:7,8 191:15,16	receiving 41:21 51:24	referring 37:5,20 98:23 187:4	relying 25:19 80:13	requested 78:9
<hr/> R <hr/>	recent 193:25	refers 65:21 98:8 127:22 128:4 169:19	remains 78:16	requests 11:25 88:9
raised 34:17	recess 56:18 103:2 151:2 191:8	reflected 16:13,18	remediation 122:2	required 108:7 192:5 193:5,7
reach 40:12 135:11 145:15	recipient 100:13,24	reflects 59:18 60:25 138:22 140:8	remember 15:13 18:18 21:19 36:10 38:16 60:7 61:10 73:12 74:15 80:3 99:20 100:15 101:21 102:13 107:15 109:14 112:17 121:12 126:19 136:21 151:6 157:6 180:2 182:10 183:11 196:9	requirement 76:5 125:24
reached 138:3	recipients 92:17 93:21	refrain 6:15	remembered 14:9	requires 67:18
read 73:12,16 79:15, 18,23 92:8 93:7 100:5,6 122:14 131:20 132:2	recognized 171:11	refresh 128:14,18 141:13 153:9	remind 38:13	research 84:13
reading 43:9 84:10 126:19 184:8	recollect 17:22	regard 36:19 41:21	renew 67:10,19	reserve 196:17
real 178:15	recollection 14:12 22:10 100:8,11,12 102:5 128:14,18 141:13 153:9 182:11 195:19	regularly 91:21 193:13	reorganized 5:11	resolution 122:20, 25 123:9 157:20
reason 13:2 15:10 40:12,15 41:13,17 47:15 66:21 80:12 98:4 154:17 157:16	record 5:2 7:13 10:12 54:6 59:2 60:10 62:19 63:8 82:7,8 142:17 185:16 190:5 193:20 196:21	regulator 108:7	rep'ed 166:4	respect 34:22 95:7 173:10
reasons 148:18	recorded 53:17 54:8, 23 55:3,4,8,10,25 58:14,17,18,20,22 63:14 64:9 79:11 134:19,21	reimbursement 142:15	repeat 28:16 40:7 176:21	respond 6:18 9:8 11:17 40:10 90:19
rebates 133:19	recording 53:18 55:13	reiterate 45:7 115:20	report 72:2 76:2,10 78:14 84:15,19 89:10 95:7 96:10,11 118:20 130:11 131:4	responded 39:23 40:8 91:8
recall 5:9 20:23 38:2, 10 40:16 41:20 52:16	records 44:12 52:24 53:14,16 54:7,12,23 55:7,14,20,24 56:21 58:15,19,21,22 59:18,25 60:11,25 61:5,14,21 62:10 63:4,18 124:6 193:9	relate 168:8,18	reported 57:18 63:25 64:12 107:13,14	responding 156:9, 10
	recover 143:22 147:20	related 17:10,11 34:11 35:25 36:8 61:25 62:14 73:14 81:9 99:5 105:2 169:7 174:3 185:4	reporter 7:13 142:17	responds 92:8 93:17
		relates 35:9 37:12, 17,25 103:4 141:20 148:3	reporting 119:21 156:9	response 9:3,4 15:7 54:17,18 63:11,12 77:6 80:8 81:13,23 82:16 83:18 85:8 86:7 91:6 92:6,9 93:13,25 94:20 95:13,20 96:19 98:9, 16,24 161:8,12 168:6
		relating 36:17 145:16	reports 94:22	responsibilities 46:7
		relation 67:17	represent 8:10 89:3 116:23	responsibility 14:21 43:9,25 62:24 65:6, 14,19 75:2,25 76:10 81:19,22 111:11 115:8 122:17 126:5 129:11 169:17 170:3, 7,9,22 171:4,19
			representation 29:21 51:8 80:3 89:6 163:20	responsible 45:18 62:17 75:16 76:6 80:11 114:19 115:5,
			representative 15:19 36:22 40:4 44:21 45:23 82:11	

Index: responsive..simple

<p>9,15 125:2,15,19 130:17,21 135:23 146:3,6 149:9 155:17,19,22,25 156:5,8,16 168:9</p> <p>responsive 11:17,24 50:14 54:3 79:2 94:3, 9 125:11 184:19</p> <p>rest 28:23 72:13</p> <p>restate 22:17 155:23 187:19</p> <p>restatement 153:6</p> <p>restraining 40:22</p> <p>restricted 34:13</p> <p>restriction 30:22 31:3,8,11 34:20,21 177:2</p> <p>restrictions 33:3,11, 15,21,24 34:11</p> <p>restroom 56:7</p> <p>result 121:7,21 147:24</p> <p>resulted 131:24 132:13 151:9</p> <p>resulting 135:6</p> <p>retail 32:15 33:10 65:22 67:5,8 70:14, 25 71:8,10 72:3,24 75:4 76:3 77:6 78:9, 15 80:9 84:6,16,19, 23 86:7,12,13,22,23 87:9 88:3,6,23 89:10 90:2 92:19 93:21,25 94:20 95:7,13,21 96:9 98:10 101:10 112:12</p> <p>retain 113:12</p> <p>retained 47:12 110:8,13,16 112:2,9 123:18 124:8</p> <p>retaining 113:18</p> <p>retention 112:11 128:15</p> <p>revealed 54:13</p> <p>revenue 66:16</p>	<p>reverse 56:22</p> <p>review 66:13 67:9 73:12,13 74:13 88:8 101:11 106:3 166:21</p> <p>reviewed 11:15,16, 21 12:2 43:5 73:14 76:24 117:17</p> <p>reviewing 65:6 76:6 77:4 193:13</p> <p>rights 113:12,19</p> <p>rise 192:19</p> <p>role 18:14 19:12,19, 21 20:3 34:12 44:15 45:2,13,14,24 46:4 65:18 69:21 76:5 80:23 113:12 177:25</p> <p>roles 19:16 46:6</p> <p>Rome 87:24</p> <p>roof 152:10</p> <p>Ross 24:3,7,18</p> <p>roughly 146:16</p> <p>Rukavina 7:25 11:19 12:5 13:22 16:19 42:7,16 56:5 70:18 82:5 102:14,20,24 103:16 115:19 116:13,22 139:13,17, 21,25 144:11 159:11, 14 163:12,21 164:8 172:5 173:18 174:11, 21 191:6 195:3 196:17,20</p> <p>rule 5:18 7:10 9:25 108:9 147:19 148:20</p> <p>rules 6:13 174:18</p> <p>run 69:2</p> <hr/> <p style="text-align: center;">S</p> <hr/> <p>safe 39:13</p> <p>sales 19:21 68:6,13</p> <p>Sauter 9:5 12:17,19 16:12,17,21 17:5,15 103:17,18 161:3 164:14,16,17 165:4, 14 166:10 167:16</p>	<p>175:9 176:9 177:25 178:15 180:18,22 181:18,23</p> <p>Sauter's 13:15 31:16 54:17 167:10 175:6 180:11 181:21,25 188:24</p> <p>scale 68:8</p> <p>scheduled 8:14,15</p> <p>schedules 31:17 32:18 46:14 187:2,4, 7</p> <p>Scott 179:13,14,25</p> <p>screen 6:23 7:10 8:12,13 9:15 10:17, 25 29:10 30:7 38:18 46:19 47:16 50:25 71:21 87:13 120:13 122:12 124:13 125:20 152:14,19 158:2 160:7 167:24 188:12</p> <p>scroll 7:20 10:12,24 11:3 29:18 47:4,20 48:5 51:10 78:3 88:16 90:8,9 91:5 93:12 96:16 133:9 158:23 175:22</p> <p>scrolling 89:20</p> <p>search 144:17</p> <p>searched 144:13 151:18</p> <p>searching 145:11</p> <p>SEC 32:20 62:12 106:3 121:3 124:3, 10,16,19 125:4,6,14 154:22,25 156:10,24</p> <p>secretary 18:17,18, 20,25 19:5 20:22 21:20,21 22:15 24:10,18,22 25:6,7, 13 72:12 75:5 77:18 94:15 97:2</p> <p>section 48:18 67:18</p> <p>Securities 74:10</p> <p>seek 106:10,17 108:2,4 142:15</p>	<p>Seery 12:3 31:18 33:8</p> <p>selection 70:2</p> <p>send 8:2 127:3 190:5</p> <p>sending 39:19 72:9, 24 74:8 75:13 100:2 127:10</p> <p>senior 105:22 106:13</p> <p>sense 37:2 177:19</p> <p>sentence 83:17 84:9,10 85:8,17 98:8, 9,13 99:24 100:10, 14,25 127:22 128:2 131:15,21 134:3 170:5 173:2,5 181:18</p> <p>separate 81:9</p> <p>September 99:7 154:2 174:20,22</p> <p>serve 21:11 66:22</p> <p>served 6:7 22:10 44:14 65:13 67:4 74:25 191:22</p> <p>server 151:19</p> <p>serves 96:25</p> <p>service 65:18 77:24</p> <p>services 9:6 27:10, 17 32:23 44:10 62:14,15 66:6,9 67:23 68:15,17,24,25 69:3 70:3,9 74:20 75:22 76:16 77:21 110:22 111:2,9,10,23 113:5,9 114:13,23 118:17 135:2,7 138:8,17 142:25 150:11 170:13,15 177:10,22,24 178:8, 11,20</p> <p>set 165:5</p> <p>settlement 60:17 70:6 138:25 140:3</p> <p>seven-and-a-half 14:7</p> <p>share 15:19 25:25</p> <p>shared 9:6 44:10 62:15 68:24 69:3</p>	<p>70:9 74:20 75:22 77:21 111:9 142:24 150:11 170:15 178:11</p> <p>shareholder 107:24</p> <p>shareholders 106:4 107:19,20,23</p> <p>sharing 177:23</p> <p>sheet 48:7 53:20 55:5 58:23,24 59:3 65:7 87:6 92:11,20 93:23 94:5 96:5 102:9 108:15,17 193:13,21</p> <p>sheets 65:15 87:5</p> <p>short 150:23 191:2</p> <p>shorten 37:21</p> <p>show 7:20 38:13 162:22 163:11</p> <p>showed 47:25 55:4 108:19</p> <p>showing 30:7 187:10</p> <p>shown 63:23 147:2</p> <p>shows 51:20 63:5</p> <p>shrinking 68:9</p> <p>sic 9:10 188:17</p> <p>side 193:15</p> <p>sides 137:25 138:2 177:7 186:7,8,14</p> <p>sign 169:9 182:12</p> <p>signature 181:15 183:6,12 187:11 193:19</p> <p>signed 42:15 47:6,8 49:9 169:8 181:7,15, 24 182:3,6 183:12,20</p> <p>significant 148:5</p> <p>signing 182:10 183:11,24 184:13 186:12</p> <p>signs 186:11</p> <p>similar 193:11,16</p> <p>simple 6:14 54:4</p>
---	--	---	--	---

Index: simplify..Thereof

60:23 93:19 183:15 193:10 simplify 54:22 simply 92:2 single 73:25 79:23 119:13 125:3 singular 170:18 sir 5:15 38:20 71:24 120:5 124:7 158:10 186:17 sit 35:22 41:14 46:9 110:15 114:9 133:3 size 192:4,15 193:12, 16 sizeable 192:25 Skyview 83:10 161:14 177:7,22 179:2 180:3 slack 178:16 sloppy 194:6 sole 26:25 27:4 101:9 191:25 Sounds 138:9 source 66:15 69:24 91:2 98:5 119:19 145:9,12 147:19 148:20 167:6 speak 12:23 13:3,5, 9,16,19 31:4,9 33:4 83:6 167:5,7 speaks 195:15 specialist 43:22 specialize 152:5 specific 38:16 44:25 72:20 86:11,18 103:24 120:17 125:24 155:12 156:12 157:4 170:24 180:2,20 specifically 44:21 49:5 65:12 84:21 86:9 99:21 125:17 180:24 181:23 192:3 specifics 156:20	speculate 84:20 speculation 34:18 41:9 122:8 150:18 spent 109:21 spoke 11:19,20,21 12:13,18 165:19,22 166:2,10 spoken 13:13 166:16 spring 103:20 Stacy 87:23 89:25 stance 157:22 standard 90:25 standards 180:7 Stang 5:10 star 147:9 start 87:20 104:2 state 155:6 stated 183:18 statement 36:6 37:22 43:13 49:4 51:6,8,20 52:2 63:23 64:9 84:15,18 85:8 100:25 106:4 161:15 165:24 166:5,6 172:4,9,21 statements 43:6,10 44:2,24 45:5,8,20 46:11,24 47:13,18 48:15,19 49:21 50:2 57:22 58:13,16 64:5, 14,17 65:10 86:23 95:15,22 101:14,18 states 133:25 step 14:18 152:5 Stephanie 25:13 179:6 stepped 181:3 stepping 64:6 steps 58:13 74:16 121:13 stop 51:11 102:21 Strand 26:13 27:3	strategist 19:21 20:5 strategy 16:24 strict 31:18 strictly 45:14 strike 44:18 45:11 50:12 53:23 60:20 62:3,21 72:17 76:22 78:25 81:15 83:11 91:23 117:25 118:12 120:3 125:9 129:16 131:8 135:25 150:15 171:14 177:12 180:15 183:14 184:18 190:24 192:11 string 88:6 101:8 structure 27:13 104:5 stuff 190:21 subject 16:4 28:14, 18 49:17,21 66:12 112:20 123:5 124:10, 16 135:9 140:10 150:2 180:13 181:8 submitted 106:2 151:20 subsequent 17:20 48:11,17 49:5,16 55:3,4,6,8 substantial 192:23, 24,25 sued 13:10 sufficient 68:18 suggest 73:4 suing 48:23 49:11 161:5,20 162:18 163:22 165:16 176:15 summarize 20:6 133:11 summary 133:12 summer 32:2 supplemental 115:23 supplied 87:4	supplying 75:10 support 9:12 44:12 76:19,20 83:4,20 84:25 185:11 186:20 188:20,21 189:11 196:4 supported 137:23 supporting 187:6 supports 187:23 190:7,15 supposed 59:10 61:2 134:25 135:6 supposedly 186:7 Surgent 72:14 89:24 90:4 surprised 60:16 63:18 139:7 surrounding 16:8 32:13 86:14 161:4 164:19 165:15 176:11 suspect 144:14 sworn 5:3,5 <hr/> T <hr/> taking 85:11 94:19 talk 13:11 14:15 34:14,15,16 67:25 68:4,5,7 69:20,23 82:23 109:18 144:12 161:10,14,16 174:3, 16 179:25 talked 14:20,21 30:21 34:9 100:22 108:23 166:12 talking 16:7 17:20 18:3 43:16 68:10,11 115:7 127:16 151:4 task 119:15,17,18 tasked 43:21 45:8 53:16 164:21 team 31:13,19 43:17 44:4 50:8 53:17,21 65:16,19 72:14 74:19 75:9 77:23 78:22	81:25 126:10 142:23 151:19 170:14 171:7 178:12,13 179:2 180:3 189:19 193:14, 17 technicality 77:14 telephonic 99:6 telling 93:20 126:15 133:3 tells 185:19,21 tendered 29:13 38:21 46:21 51:3 71:22 87:14 119:10 158:8 term 30:20 terms 104:4,8 105:24 Terrestar 109:18,23 110:3,6,9,23 111:4 112:15,21 113:10,17 114:3,20 117:15 118:22 119:16 120:25 121:9 124:9 137:16 138:18 146:23 147:10 testified 5:5 41:20 60:4,6 83:24 85:3 104:21 126:18 140:19 151:17 182:9 192:7,8 193:12 195:16 testify 10:6 27:22 52:17,20 testimony 22:15 42:23 51:17 60:3 64:15 75:23 79:15,19 80:17 81:7 84:3 85:3 185:14 190:22 192:12 195:15,16,21 Texas 147:18 148:20 Thedford 24:22 25:6 31:7,23 71:12 72:11 75:5 76:8 77:15 83:6 89:23 91:11 94:12 96:20,24 Thedford's 94:13 theory 147:25 148:2 Thereof 9:12
--	--	--	---	---

Index: thing..wait

thing 69:19 136:3 160:18 things 11:22 12:7,8 13:10 31:25 32:3 33:19 67:22 68:15 75:8 91:20 161:10 thinking 35:11 71:5 third-party 112:5 128:16 Thomas 72:14 88:21 thought 50:8 63:15 182:18 186:15 thousands 163:8 threw 148:9 time 6:23,24 7:4 8:4, 15 15:15 18:2,21 20:14,24 21:20 22:4, 5 24:7,24 27:18 31:14 32:16 33:12,19 39:20,24 40:7,16 41:3 43:15,23 46:16 54:19 55:7 56:6 58:17 64:4 73:6,10, 11 94:17 95:10 96:24 97:9,25 99:25 102:19 104:23 106:15 107:8 109:17,22 110:2 113:21 114:4 119:13 120:24 121:19 124:14 126:13,15,24 129:3 135:4 136:5 143:16 145:6,17,24 148:13 150:24 153:12 155:12,14,15, 25 157:4,23,24 158:11 159:9 161:9, 18 162:15,16 163:25 164:2 166:15,18,20 168:5,12 172:7,17 173:24 175:3 176:17, 20,24 177:11,16 178:7 180:10 183:17 194:22 time- 20:21 timeline 20:21 times 13:19,21 43:16 timing 154:7 title 18:8,11 19:12,24 20:12 24:12	titled 122:20 titles 19:16 23:17 today 5:13,17 6:4,23 7:24 8:14,15 9:25 10:7 18:6 36:24 37:10 42:3 44:21 57:19 62:8 64:15,21 79:5 114:10 117:18 133:4 159:6,21 172:10 today's 8:4 11:12 13:20 14:2 15:3 82:20 173:2 told 15:8 31:24 40:4 41:4 60:8 86:6 97:23 100:16,19 117:12 118:14 119:19 124:19 125:7 129:2, 20 130:15 132:6 137:17 140:18 143:15 150:7 182:3, 11,13 183:2 185:18 186:4 tolling 113:22 top 86:3 102:22 146:13 topic 9:17 17:15 23:5,9 27:19,21 28:5 29:6,8 36:14,18 52:16,20 63:2 65:20, 21 99:17 103:4,12,14 104:18 117:16 141:19 142:10 158:13,14 161:17 163:2 topics 10:8,13,16,20, 25 11:8 14:14 16:16 22:25 34:17 57:6 102:18 114:15 115:21 total 107:2,4,5 108:13 109:12 133:15,21 146:12 147:8,14 totality 102:5 trading 27:8,10,11 transaction 108:18 transactions 14:8 129:4,14,23 130:10, 22 153:13 194:19	transcript 84:11 transcripts 186:21 187:18 transfer 14:7,11 15:10 51:14,21 52:7 60:13 183:2,4 185:18,20,21,22 transferred 51:18 134:18 137:23 140:13,14 168:19 172:13 transfers 52:18 54:23 108:23 182:20, 21 195:12,23 transition 177:9 transitioned 97:13 treasurer 24:9,17,22 25:5,12 39:7 43:14, 25 44:8,14,22,25 45:2,15,24 46:4,8 65:17 75:13,25 76:5 80:22 96:21 191:22 treated 56:2 57:15 62:9 Trey 24:8,15,23 trick 159:19 TRO 40:22 true 44:3,24 45:20 65:15 75:3 76:2,11 80:8 81:19,23 125:20 126:6 trusts 26:8 Tuesday 92:17 turn 30:5 110:5 158:21 169:11 turned 183:3 two-thirds 26:9,19 146:16 tying 190:9 typical 86:25 typically 99:5 104:8 typo 90:24	<hr/> U <hr/> Uh-huh 8:25 11:4 23:4 52:19 53:11 88:22 93:16 118:24 141:21 176:12 ultimate 124:24 ultimately 110:5 129:11 130:17 171:21,24 unable 31:24 41:5 178:13 179:20,21 180:7 unaudited 95:17,22 96:4 101:14,18 unauthorized 85:9 unaware 40:5 64:16, 22 unclear 101:22 uncomfortable 33:14 underlying 82:23 101:25 understand 5:14,16 12:10 15:17 48:17 103:6 106:19 113:12, 19 115:20 128:11 148:18 160:6 understanding 13:8 15:23 30:14 46:3 53:2 54:8 55:2 78:8 103:8,22 106:7 111:16 122:22 139:8 147:18 159:6 160:5 161:6 184:25 understood 32:21 undertake 106:25 undertaken 115:2 116:8 167:16 undertaking 113:24 114:5,10 undertook 16:13,18 164:18 166:21 unfettered 34:6,8 173:11,16 175:2,8 177:15,19	unusual 91:19 urgency 56:6 utilized 124:3 utilizing 178:7 <hr/> V <hr/> vagueness 172:6 valid 50:5,9 143:11 valuation 32:23 62:16,17 109:18,23 110:3,6,10,12,24 111:10,14,15,17 112:6,16,17,20,21,25 113:4,10,17 114:3, 13,20,24 115:10 117:15 118:16,22 119:16,22 121:9 124:9 128:17 129:8,9 130:8,21 132:9 135:2,7,16 137:11,16 138:8,18 146:24 147:10 154:24 155:5, 9,16,18 156:2,4,8 170:13 171:7,9 valuations 115:9 131:6 156:16 verified 107:14 verify 125:24 vice 18:13 19:3,6,18 20:2,7 21:5,11,17 22:10 24:8,13,16,21 25:4 43:4 73:25 74:5, 7 97:4 116:5 view 14:3 178:20 viewed 75:21 violating 174:18 Vitiello 25:13 179:6 voluntary 108:3 vote 106:5 107:24 voted 104:10 105:12 <hr/> W <hr/> wait 13:17 159:22
--	---	--	--	--

Index: waited..Zoom

<p>waited 157:16</p> <p>wanted 143:22</p> <p>water 56:12</p> <p>Waterhouse 12:3,23 13:3,6 14:10 15:5 24:9,17,22 25:4,11 39:5,7,13 41:14 42:5 43:15,24 44:22 60:4 65:16 71:13 75:9,12, 24 78:22 80:14,22 81:25 82:24 83:23 90:12 91:8,12 92:7, 13,16 93:17 96:20 97:23 98:12 99:16 100:9,13,16 140:12 142:23 144:25 151:19 161:16 165:13,19 167:8 171:8 173:24 175:2 176:19,25 177:4,15 181:7,13,24 182:2,6 183:10,19,23 184:4, 12 186:3,11 191:16, 18,22 192:2,6,16 193:14,19 194:3,17 195:9,22</p> <p>Waterhouse's 84:11 92:8 93:13,20 96:19 99:25 100:25 173:20 181:17 183:6 187:11</p> <p>week 162:4</p> <p>weeks 12:5 13:21 42:15 152:3 155:2</p> <p>weighted 131:23 132:8</p> <p>weighting 129:6,25 131:12</p> <p>Willmore 25:6</p> <p>wishes 91:25</p> <p>withdrawn 35:13 55:22 80:5 82:12,13 92:14 109:10 117:11 122:18 127:4,5 168:16</p> <p>witnesses 190:22</p> <p>wondering 100:19</p> <p>word 35:21 91:9 131:8 142:14 163:9, 15,16 165:2 183:6</p>	<p>187:8 189:15</p> <p>wording 83:25</p> <p>words 14:18 169:16</p> <p>work 31:20,24 43:19 96:3 111:19 112:14 113:16 114:2 117:14 118:6 119:15 146:23 164:25 165:4 168:11, 21 178:13 179:20,21 180:7</p> <p>worked 32:21 124:5</p> <p>working 33:2,8 41:11 56:8 72:5 112:22 115:11 117:20 135:16 146:10 178:18 180:4</p> <p>works 5:23</p> <p>world 49:9 104:6 126:24 186:23 187:22 189:11</p> <p>worth 160:10</p> <p>writing 124:20 144:2 172:17</p> <p>written 66:10</p> <p>wrong 8:24 73:4 114:12</p> <p>wrote 181:18</p> <hr/> <p style="text-align: center;">Y</p> <hr/> <p>year 16:13 49:6 57:24 68:3 85:23 97:21</p> <p>year-end 57:15</p> <p>years 18:21 76:18 79:12 148:5,7</p> <p>yesterday 9:13 54:19 193:25</p> <p>Yup 52:19 54:5 70:11 86:4 92:4 127:21 133:22 158:6</p> <hr/> <p style="text-align: center;">Z</p> <hr/> <p>Ziehl 5:10</p> <p>Zoom 12:4</p>
---	---

EXHIBIT 193

IN THE UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS
DALLAS DIVISION

IN RE:) Chapter 11
HIGHLAND CAPITAL) Case No.
MANAGEMENT, LP,) 19-34054-
Debtor.) sgj11
-----)
HIGHLAND CAPITAL)
MANAGEMENT, LP,) Adversary
Plaintiff,) Proceeding
vs.) No.
) 21-03004
)
HIGHLAND CAPITAL)
MANAGEMENT FUND ADVISORS,)
LP,)
Defendant.)
-----)

REMOTE ZOOM DEPOSITION OF DENNIS C. SAUTER

Wednesday, November 17, 2021

Reported by:

Stacey L. Daywalt

JOB NO. 202810

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 2</p> <p>1</p> <p>2</p> <p>3 Wednesday, November 17, 2021</p> <p>4 1:08 p.m.</p> <p>5</p> <p>6</p> <p>7 Remote Zoom Deposition of DENNIS C.</p> <p>8 SAUTER, held before Stacey L. Daywalt, a Court</p> <p>9 Reporter and Notary Public of the District of</p> <p>10 Columbia.</p> <p>11</p> <p>12</p> <p>13</p> <p>14</p> <p>15</p> <p>16</p> <p>17</p> <p>18</p> <p>19</p> <p>20</p> <p>21</p> <p>22</p> <p>23</p> <p>24</p> <p>25</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 3</p> <p>1 A P P E A R A N C E S:</p> <p>2 (All appearances via remote Zoom)</p> <p>3</p> <p>4 PACHULSKI STANG ZIEHL & JONES</p> <p>5 Attorneys for Plaintiff</p> <p>6 780 Third Avenue</p> <p>7 New York, New York 10017</p> <p>8 BY: JOHN MORRIS, ESQ.</p> <p>9</p> <p>10 MUNSCH HARDT KOPF & HARR</p> <p>11 Attorneys for Defendant</p> <p>12 500 North Akard Street</p> <p>13 Dallas, Texas 75201</p> <p>14 BY: DAVOR RUKAVINA, ESQ.</p> <p>15</p> <p>16 STINSON LLP</p> <p>17 Attorneys for James Dondero and Nancy</p> <p>18 Dondero</p> <p>19 3102 Oak Lawn Avenue</p> <p>20 Dallas, Texas 75219</p> <p>21 BY: MICHAEL AIGEN, ESQ.</p> <p>22</p> <p>23 ALSO PRESENT:</p> <p>24</p> <p>25 LA ASIA CANTY</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 4</p> <p>1 D. Sauter</p> <p>2 DENNIS C. SAUTER,</p> <p>3 called as a witness, having been</p> <p>4 duly sworn by a Notary Public, was examined and</p> <p>5 testified as follows:</p> <p>6</p> <p>7 EXAMINATION BY</p> <p>8 MR. MORRIS:</p> <p>9 Q. Can you please state your name for</p> <p>10 the record.</p> <p>11 A. Dennis Sauter.</p> <p>12 Q. Good afternoon, Mr. Sauter. My name</p> <p>13 is John Morris. I'm an attorney at Pachulski</p> <p>14 Stang Ziehl & Jones. We are counsel to the</p> <p>15 reorganized Highland Capital Management, LP.</p> <p>16 Are you aware of that?</p> <p>17 A. Yes, sir.</p> <p>18 Q. Okay. And we're here for your</p> <p>19 deposition today. Correct?</p> <p>20 A. Yes, sir.</p> <p>21 Q. And I've examined you previously.</p> <p>22 Is that right?</p> <p>23 A. I don't believe so.</p> <p>24 Q. Okay. Have you ever been deposed</p> <p>25 before?</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 5</p> <p>1 D. Sauter</p> <p>2 A. I don't think so.</p> <p>3 Q. Okay. So very simple ground rules.</p> <p>4 I'm going to ask you a series of</p> <p>5 questions, and it's important that you allow me</p> <p>6 to finish my question before you begin the</p> <p>7 answer.</p> <p>8 Is that fair?</p> <p>9 A. Yes, sir.</p> <p>10 Q. And I will certainly attempt to do</p> <p>11 the same for you and -- insofar as I will</p> <p>12 attempt to allow you to finish your answer</p> <p>13 before I begin my question.</p> <p>14 But if I fail to do that, will you</p> <p>15 let me know?</p> <p>16 A. I will.</p> <p>17 Q. If there's anything that I ask you</p> <p>18 that you don't understand, will you let me know</p> <p>19 that?</p> <p>20 A. I will.</p> <p>21 Q. If you want to take a break at any</p> <p>22 time, just let me know and I'll try to</p> <p>23 accommodate you. I'd only ask that you don't</p> <p>24 ask for a break while a question is pending.</p> <p>25 Is that fair?</p>

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 6</p> <p>1 D. Sauter</p> <p>2 A. That's fair.</p> <p>3 Q. Okay. Do you have a license to</p> <p>4 practice law, sir?</p> <p>5 A. I do.</p> <p>6 Q. In what states are you admitted to</p> <p>7 practice?</p> <p>8 A. Just Texas.</p> <p>9 Q. When did you obtain your license?</p> <p>10 A. November of 2001.</p> <p>11 Q. And did you graduate from law</p> <p>12 school?</p> <p>13 A. I did.</p> <p>14 Q. Where did you graduate from law</p> <p>15 school?</p> <p>16 A. Southern Methodist University.</p> <p>17 Q. And can you describe for me your</p> <p>18 employment history from the time you graduated</p> <p>19 law school until today.</p> <p>20 A. Sure.</p> <p>21 Out of law school I began at a firm</p> <p>22 called Winstead Sechrest & Minick. And I was</p> <p>23 there just till tax day, so April 15 of 2002,</p> <p>24 when my group moved to a firm at the time that</p> <p>25 was called Godwin Gruber. I was at Godwin</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 7</p> <p>1 D. Sauter</p> <p>2 Gruber until 2006.</p> <p>3 And I went in-house with a</p> <p>4 development firm called St. Ives Realty. I was</p> <p>5 there until 2009.</p> <p>6 And in 2009, I went back to work</p> <p>7 with the group I'd worked with before but now</p> <p>8 it was called Langley Weinstein. I was with</p> <p>9 Langley Weinstein until December 31 of '13.</p> <p>10 And in 2014, I started at Wick</p> <p>11 Phillips Gould & Martin, and I was at Wick</p> <p>12 Phillips until February of 2020 when I began at</p> <p>13 Nexpoint.</p> <p>14 Q. And while you were at Nexpoint -- I</p> <p>15 mean, withdrawn.</p> <p>16 While you were at Wick Phillips, did</p> <p>17 you provide services to Highland or any of its</p> <p>18 affiliates?</p> <p>19 A. I provided services primarily to</p> <p>20 Nexpoint advisors and its wholly owned</p> <p>21 subsidiaries.</p> <p>22 I did have occasion to do a couple</p> <p>23 of discrete engagements for -- I think they</p> <p>24 were CLOs but managed by Highland.</p> <p>25 Q. Prior to the time that you joined</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 8</p> <p>1 D. Sauter</p> <p>2 Nexpoint, did you have any particular expertise</p> <p>3 in a specified area of the law?</p> <p>4 A. For about the last ten years, real</p> <p>5 estate.</p> <p>6 It was, before that, kind of a</p> <p>7 hybrid of construction related litigation,</p> <p>8 landlord-tenant disputes, you know,</p> <p>9 foreclosures. It was all real estate related</p> <p>10 litigation and then real estate transactional</p> <p>11 work.</p> <p>12 Q. How did you come to become employed</p> <p>13 by Nexpoint?</p> <p>14 A. I had worked with the folks here at</p> <p>15 Nexpoint for my entire tenure at Wick Phillips,</p> <p>16 and they gave me an offer and I accepted.</p> <p>17 Q. What offer did they give you? What</p> <p>18 position?</p> <p>19 A. I was hired to be general counsel of</p> <p>20 real estate.</p> <p>21 Q. Are you still the general counsel of</p> <p>22 real estate?</p> <p>23 A. I'm now the general counsel of</p> <p>24 Nexpoint.</p> <p>25 Q. When did you become the general</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 9</p> <p>1 D. Sauter</p> <p>2 counsel of Nexpoint?</p> <p>3 A. I don't recall exactly, but I would</p> <p>4 say April or May of this year.</p> <p>5 Q. All right. So from approximately</p> <p>6 February of 2020 until approximately April of</p> <p>7 2021, you were the general counsel of real</p> <p>8 estate, and since approximately April of 2021</p> <p>9 you were -- you have been the general counsel</p> <p>10 of Nexpoint.</p> <p>11 Do I have that right?</p> <p>12 A. Correct.</p> <p>13 Q. Was there a general counsel of</p> <p>14 Nexpoint during the time you served as general</p> <p>15 counsel of real estate?</p> <p>16 A. There was not.</p> <p>17 Generally the way things worked is</p> <p>18 Scott Ellington was general counsel at Highland</p> <p>19 Capital, and most of the legal department</p> <p>20 reported to him. I was the one attorney that</p> <p>21 was not under him.</p> <p>22 So no, there was not.</p> <p>23 Q. Okay. To whom do you report today?</p> <p>24 A. Matt McGraner.</p> <p>25 Q. And what is Mr. McGraner's title?</p>

<p>Page 10</p> <p>1 D. Sauter</p> <p>2 A. I believe it's managing director.</p> <p>3 Q. When did you begin reporting to</p> <p>4 Mr. McGraner?</p> <p>5 A. The day I was hired.</p> <p>6 Q. What are your duties and</p> <p>7 responsibilities today as the general counsel</p> <p>8 of Nexpoint?</p> <p>9 A. A lot different than I anticipated</p> <p>10 when I came on.</p> <p>11 Q. Fair.</p> <p>12 A. It's a little bit of everything. I</p> <p>13 get lots of questions from lots of different</p> <p>14 people.</p> <p>15 As you can imagine, there's been</p> <p>16 quite a shuffle with the Skyview formation,</p> <p>17 people leaving, people staying, and so, you</p> <p>18 know, it's been fairly fluid. So I try to</p> <p>19 handle whatever somebody brings me.</p> <p>20 Q. In your capacity as general counsel,</p> <p>21 do you have any responsibility for overseeing</p> <p>22 Nexpoint's litigation matters?</p> <p>23 A. I do.</p> <p>24 Q. Okay. And do you have</p> <p>25 responsibility for overseeing Nexpoint's</p>	<p>Page 11</p> <p>1 D. Sauter</p> <p>2 defense of the lawsuit that Highland has</p> <p>3 commenced against it?</p> <p>4 MR. RUKAVINA: Allow me to interject</p> <p>5 just a little bit here, John.</p> <p>6 You subpoenaed Mr. Sauter in the</p> <p>7 HCMFA lawsuit.</p> <p>8 Why are you asking him all about</p> <p>9 this Nexpoint?</p> <p>10 MR. MORRIS: Just because he told me</p> <p>11 that's where he works.</p> <p>12 MR. RUKAVINA: Yeah, that's fine.</p> <p>13 I mean, I'm not trying to be rude.</p> <p>14 Just --</p> <p>15 MR. MORRIS: I appreciate that.</p> <p>16 MR. RUKAVINA: -- if you're --</p> <p>17 (Simultaneous crosstalk.)</p> <p>18 MR. MORRIS: Duly noted. Thank you,</p> <p>19 Davor.</p> <p>20 THE REPORTER: Please watch the</p> <p>21 overlap of talking. Thank you.</p> <p>22 BY MR. MORRIS:</p> <p>23 Q. Mr. Sauter, Mr. Rukavina brings up a</p> <p>24 good point.</p> <p>25 Are you also the general counsel of</p>
<p>Page 12</p> <p>1 D. Sauter</p> <p>2 Highland Capital Management Fund Advisors, LLP?</p> <p>3 A. I'm not.</p> <p>4 Q. You are not?</p> <p>5 A. I'm not the general counsel of</p> <p>6 Highland Capital Management Fund Advisors.</p> <p>7 Q. Okay. Can we refer to that entity</p> <p>8 as HCMFA today?</p> <p>9 A. Yes, sir.</p> <p>10 Q. Do you have any title or role with</p> <p>11 HCMFA today?</p> <p>12 A. I don't have any official capacity</p> <p>13 with HCMFA, although I do perform work from</p> <p>14 time to time for HCMFA.</p> <p>15 Q. Okay. Does HCMFA have a general</p> <p>16 counsel, to the best of your knowledge?</p> <p>17 A. It does not.</p> <p>18 Q. Does HCMFA have any officers today,</p> <p>19 to the best of your knowledge?</p> <p>20 A. It does, but I'm not sure I can name</p> <p>21 them off to you.</p> <p>22 Q. Okay. What services do you provide</p> <p>23 to HCMFA?</p> <p>24 A. Again, like other affiliated</p> <p>25 entities, when it has legal needs that meet my</p>	<p>Page 13</p> <p>1 D. Sauter</p> <p>2 expertise, people bring it to me and I work on</p> <p>3 it.</p> <p>4 Q. And what's an "affiliated entity" in</p> <p>5 the way that you've used that term?</p> <p>6 A. I generally refer to HCMFA, Nexpoint</p> <p>7 Advisors and the wholly owned subsidiaries of</p> <p>8 Nexpoint Advisors as the affiliated entities.</p> <p>9 HCMFA also owns Nexpoint Securities,</p> <p>10 which is the broker dealer, and so I do work</p> <p>11 with those folks from time to time as well.</p> <p>12 Q. Is there a source of affiliation</p> <p>13 between Nexpoint and HCMFA?</p> <p>14 A. Yes, Mr. Dondero.</p> <p>15 Q. And he controls them both to the</p> <p>16 best of your knowledge. Is that right?</p> <p>17 A. I -- I guess it depends on how you</p> <p>18 define "control."</p> <p>19 But yes, he is a controlling person</p> <p>20 of Nexpoint Advisors, and yes, for all intents</p> <p>21 and purposes, he's the controlling person of</p> <p>22 HCMFA.</p> <p>23 Q. Okay. And can we refer to HCMFA and</p> <p>24 Nexpoint Advisors, LP together as "the</p> <p>25 advisors"?</p>

<p>Page 14</p> <p>1 D. Sauter</p> <p>2 A. That's fine.</p> <p>3 Q. The advisors are each advisory</p> <p>4 firms. Is that right?</p> <p>5 A. Correct.</p> <p>6 Q. And each of them provide advisory</p> <p>7 services to certain funds. Is that correct?</p> <p>8 A. Correct.</p> <p>9 Q. Okay. Do you hold any titles with</p> <p>10 any of the funds that are advised by either of</p> <p>11 the advisors?</p> <p>12 A. Yes, I am general counsel for</p> <p>13 Nexpoint Residential Trust and I'm general</p> <p>14 counsel of Nexpoint Real Estate Finance.</p> <p>15 Q. Any others?</p> <p>16 A. No, sir.</p> <p>17 Q. Okay. Do you have --</p> <p>18 A. Wait. Wait. Let me clarify.</p> <p>19 I think I am general counsel of</p> <p>20 Nexpoint Real Estate Advisors, and I may be</p> <p>21 general counsel of each of them. I think there</p> <p>22 are nine in total.</p> <p>23 Q. Okay. And are each of them separate</p> <p>24 funds?</p> <p>25 A. Each of the advisors are -- manage a</p>	<p>Page 15</p> <p>1 D. Sauter</p> <p>2 discrete business line. They're separate</p> <p>3 entities, but not necessarily funds.</p> <p>4 Q. And are each of them owned</p> <p>5 indirectly or directly by Nexpoint Advisors,</p> <p>6 LP?</p> <p>7 A. Yes, sir.</p> <p>8 Q. Okay.</p> <p>9 When did you first meet Mr. Dondero?</p> <p>10 A. I don't recall.</p> <p>11 I think I met him once at an event</p> <p>12 that I was invited to years ago, maybe 2017.</p> <p>13 Q. Do you know if he holds a title at</p> <p>14 HCMFA?</p> <p>15 A. I don't believe he does.</p> <p>16 Q. How about Nexpoint? Does he hold a</p> <p>17 title at Nexpoint?</p> <p>18 A. Yes, he's the president.</p> <p>19 Q. And even though he doesn't hold a</p> <p>20 title at HCMFA, it's your understanding that he</p> <p>21 controls HCMFA. Is that right?</p> <p>22 A. I don't know that I would say that.</p> <p>23 And again, I would need to look at</p> <p>24 the organizational documents.</p> <p>25 Q. Well, as -- withdrawn.</p>
<p>Page 16</p> <p>1 D. Sauter</p> <p>2 Do you know if Mr. Dondero serves as</p> <p>3 the portfolio manager for any of the funds to</p> <p>4 which the advisors provide advisory services?</p> <p>5 A. He does.</p> <p>6 I don't know which ones.</p> <p>7 Q. We're going to talk in a little</p> <p>8 while about a TerreStar NAV issue.</p> <p>9 MR. MORRIS: And Stacey, that's all</p> <p>10 caps N-A-V, and it's T-E-R-R-A-S-T-A-R [sic].</p> <p>11 Q. We're going to talk a little bit</p> <p>12 about a TerreStar NAV issue.</p> <p>13 Are you generally familiar with</p> <p>14 that?</p> <p>15 A. Generally.</p> <p>16 Q. Okay. And is it your understanding</p> <p>17 that that NAV issue, that TerreStar NAV issue,</p> <p>18 related to certain equity positions that were</p> <p>19 held by certain funds managed by HCMFA?</p> <p>20 A. Yes, I think it was -- Global</p> <p>21 Allocation Fund is the one that was</p> <p>22 particularly the insured.</p> <p>23 Q. And can we refer to that as GAF?</p> <p>24 A. Yes, sir.</p> <p>25 Q. Do you know who the portfolio</p>	<p>Page 17</p> <p>1 D. Sauter</p> <p>2 manager of GAF was in 2019?</p> <p>3 A. I do not.</p> <p>4 Q. Do you know if it was Mr. Dondero?</p> <p>5 A. I do not.</p> <p>6 Q. In the course of your investigation,</p> <p>7 did you ever ask who the portfolio manager of</p> <p>8 GAF was?</p> <p>9 A. I did not.</p> <p>10 Q. Do you know Frank Waterhouse?</p> <p>11 A. I do.</p> <p>12 Q. When did you first meet</p> <p>13 Mr. Waterhouse?</p> <p>14 A. I think I met him just before I came</p> <p>15 on. It would have been maybe December of 2019.</p> <p>16 Q. Okay. Do you know if Mr. Waterhouse</p> <p>17 holds any titles with either of the advisors?</p> <p>18 A. I believe so, but I'm not exactly</p> <p>19 sure.</p> <p>20 MR. RUKAVINA: I'm going to object</p> <p>21 to vague or form there.</p> <p>22 What time are you specifying,</p> <p>23 Mr. Morris?</p> <p>24 MR. MORRIS: I appreciate that. Let</p> <p>25 me restate the question.</p>

<p>Page 18</p> <p>1 D. Sauter</p> <p>2 BY MR. MORRIS:</p> <p>3 Q. Mr. Sauter, do you know if</p> <p>4 Mr. Waterhouse held any position with either of</p> <p>5 the advisors at any time in 2019?</p> <p>6 A. I believe he did, but I -- I would</p> <p>7 say it was probably treasurer and CFO, but I'm</p> <p>8 speculating.</p> <p>9 Q. In the course of your investigation,</p> <p>10 did you try to determine what title</p> <p>11 Mr. Waterhouse held with HCMFA?</p> <p>12 A. I have not.</p> <p>13 Q. Have you ever tried to determine</p> <p>14 what title Mr. Waterhouse held at HCMFA at any</p> <p>15 time?</p> <p>16 A. At one point I knew what it is. I</p> <p>17 just can't recall.</p> <p>18 Q. Okay. Does -- do you know if</p> <p>19 Mr. Waterhouse holds a position with HCMFA</p> <p>20 today?</p> <p>21 A. I believe he does.</p> <p>22 Q. Do you have any understanding as to</p> <p>23 what that position is?</p> <p>24 A. Again, I think it's CFO and/or</p> <p>25 treasurer. That's consistent, I think.</p>	<p>Page 19</p> <p>1 D. Sauter</p> <p>2 Q. Do you have any understanding as to</p> <p>3 when Mr. Waterhouse became the treasurer and/or</p> <p>4 the CFO of HCMFA?</p> <p>5 A. I do not.</p> <p>6 Q. Do you know if Mr. Waterhouse holds</p> <p>7 any positions with any of the funds that are</p> <p>8 advised by either of the advisors?</p> <p>9 A. I believe he -- I'm speculating. I</p> <p>10 don't know for certain.</p> <p>11 Q. During the course of your -- you</p> <p>12 conducted an investigation around the TerreStar</p> <p>13 NAV issue. Right?</p> <p>14 A. Correct.</p> <p>15 Q. Okay. During the course of your</p> <p>16 investigation, did you ever try to determine</p> <p>17 whether Mr. Waterhouse served in any capacity</p> <p>18 with any of the funds that are managed by</p> <p>19 HCMFA?</p> <p>20 A. Whether he -- yes.</p> <p>21 Q. And what did you -- what information</p> <p>22 did you learn in the course of your</p> <p>23 investigation on that issue?</p> <p>24 A. My understanding is that the</p> <p>25 valuation team was a subset of the group that</p>
<p>Page 20</p> <p>1 D. Sauter</p> <p>2 Mr. Waterhouse ran.</p> <p>3 Q. Right.</p> <p>4 I'm asking you specifically about</p> <p>5 whether he held positions at any of the funds.</p> <p>6 Did you understand that when I asked</p> <p>7 my question?</p> <p>8 A. I don't know whether he held any</p> <p>9 position with the funds.</p> <p>10 Q. Okay. And during your</p> <p>11 investigation, did you make any effort to try</p> <p>12 to determine whether he held any positions with</p> <p>13 GAF?</p> <p>14 Let's be very specific.</p> <p>15 A. I don't recall.</p> <p>16 Q. Do you know a gentleman named Will</p> <p>17 Mabry?</p> <p>18 A. I do.</p> <p>19 Q. And do you know if Mr. Mabry was</p> <p>20 ever employed by either of the advisors?</p> <p>21 A. I don't know who employed Mr. Mabry.</p> <p>22 Q. Do you know if he was ever employed</p> <p>23 by Highland Capital Management, LP?</p> <p>24 A. I would suspect that he was employed</p> <p>25 by Highland Capital Management, LP.</p>	<p>Page 21</p> <p>1 D. Sauter</p> <p>2 Q. Okay. And what's the basis for that</p> <p>3 speculation?</p> <p>4 A. Because he's at Skyview, and I think</p> <p>5 all of the employees that were at Nexpoint</p> <p>6 Advisors or HCMFA remained where they were.</p> <p>7 Q. Do you know what position he held at</p> <p>8 Highland in 2019, if any?</p> <p>9 A. I don't know.</p> <p>10 Q. Do you know anything about</p> <p>11 Mr. Mabry's skills or expertise, if any?</p> <p>12 A. Other than I believe he was the</p> <p>13 assistant treasurer at GAF and he was on the</p> <p>14 valuation team as well.</p> <p>15 Q. So your understanding is he was the</p> <p>16 assistant treasurer of the fund that we have</p> <p>17 defined as GAF.</p> <p>18 Do I have that right?</p> <p>19 A. That's my understanding.</p> <p>20 Q. Okay. And what's the basis for that</p> <p>21 understanding?</p> <p>22 A. That's just what I recall.</p> <p>23 Q. Okay. To the best of your</p> <p>24 knowledge, does he have an accounting</p> <p>25 background?</p>

<p>Page 22</p> <p>1 D. Sauter</p> <p>2 A. I don't know.</p> <p>3 Q. And is it your understanding that he</p> <p>4 was part of a valuation team?</p> <p>5 I think you used that term.</p> <p>6 A. Yes, I believe he was.</p> <p>7 Q. Okay. And what's the basis for that</p> <p>8 understanding on your part?</p> <p>9 A. Discussions that I've had with Frank</p> <p>10 and his knowledge of the TerreStar NAV error.</p> <p>11 Q. Did Mr. Mabry tell you that he was</p> <p>12 part of the valuation team?</p> <p>13 A. I don't recall.</p> <p>14 Q. Did you ask him?</p> <p>15 A. I don't recall.</p> <p>16 Q. Do you know if Mr. Mabry played any</p> <p>17 role in any aspect of the TerreStar</p> <p>18 investigation that was conducted by the SEC?</p> <p>19 A. I don't know.</p> <p>20 Q. Did you ask Mr. Mabry if he played</p> <p>21 any role in connection with the SEC</p> <p>22 investigation?</p> <p>23 A. I did not.</p> <p>24 Q. Do you know if Mr. Mabry played any</p> <p>25 role in formulating HCMFA's response to the</p>	<p>Page 23</p> <p>1 D. Sauter</p> <p>2 SEC?</p> <p>3 A. I do not.</p> <p>4 Q. Did you ask him?</p> <p>5 A. I don't recall.</p> <p>6 Q. Do you know when he left Highland?</p> <p>7 A. I think he was terminated with the</p> <p>8 other employees.</p> <p>9 Q. You submitted a declaration in</p> <p>10 connection with the adversary proceeding that</p> <p>11 Highland commenced against the HCMFA.</p> <p>12 Do I have that right?</p> <p>13 A. Yes, sir.</p> <p>14 Q. All right. Let's take a look at</p> <p>15 that, if we can put that up on the screen.</p> <p>16 So from time to time, my assistant</p> <p>17 Ms. Canty is going to put some documents up on</p> <p>18 the screen, Mr. Sauter. And it's very</p> <p>19 important that you understand that I will give</p> <p>20 you every opportunity that you believe you need</p> <p>21 in order to read the document.</p> <p>22 So you know, if there's something</p> <p>23 that I put up there that you want to see more</p> <p>24 of, just let me know and we'll just scroll</p> <p>25 around. Okay?</p>
<p>Page 24</p> <p>1 D. Sauter</p> <p>2 A. Okay.</p> <p>3 (Exhibit 181, Declaration of Dennis</p> <p>4 C. Sauter, Jr., previously marked for</p> <p>5 identification.)</p> <p>6 Q. Okay. Do you see the first page of</p> <p>7 this document states that it's your</p> <p>8 declaration?</p> <p>9 A. I do.</p> <p>10 Q. And if we can go to the signature</p> <p>11 line, please.</p> <p>12 And that's your signature there,</p> <p>13 sir?</p> <p>14 A. It is.</p> <p>15 Q. And did you sign this on or about</p> <p>16 May 21st, 2021?</p> <p>17 A. Yes, sir.</p> <p>18 Q. Do you remember the purpose of this</p> <p>19 declaration?</p> <p>20 A. It was requesting to file an amended</p> <p>21 answer.</p> <p>22 Q. Okay. Is it fair to say that your</p> <p>23 declaration sets forth the factual basis for</p> <p>24 the proposed amendment?</p> <p>25 A. Yes.</p>	<p>Page 25</p> <p>1 D. Sauter</p> <p>2 Q. And is it fair to say that your</p> <p>3 declaration describes the investigation that</p> <p>4 you did initially after the complaint was filed</p> <p>5 and then basically a second phase of the</p> <p>6 investigation after Mr. Waterhouse and</p> <p>7 Mr. Mabry migrated from Highland?</p> <p>8 A. Yes.</p> <p>9 Q. Okay. So the purpose of your</p> <p>10 investigation was to understand the origin of</p> <p>11 two promissory notes. Right?</p> <p>12 A. Yes, sir.</p> <p>13 Q. Okay. I just want to go through to</p> <p>14 the notes to make sure that the record is clear</p> <p>15 that we're talking about the same thing.</p> <p>16 There are certain documents that</p> <p>17 we've used in other depositions so they've been</p> <p>18 premarked, and I'd ask Ms. Canty to put up the</p> <p>19 document that's already been marked as</p> <p>20 Exhibit 54.</p> <p>21 MS. CANTY: Okay. John, do you want</p> <p>22 to let the court reporter know this current one</p> <p>23 is 181, premarked 181, this declaration.</p> <p>24 MR. MORRIS: Okay. Fine.</p> <p>25 (Exhibit 54, E-mail chain with</p>

<p>Page 26</p> <p>1 D. Sauter</p> <p>2 attachment dated 5/2/19, D-CNL003777-779,</p> <p>3 previously marked for identification.)</p> <p>4 Q. So if could just scroll down a</p> <p>5 little bit.</p> <p>6 Do you see there's -- do you see</p> <p>7 it's -- there's an e-mail from David Klos dated</p> <p>8 May 2nd?</p> <p>9 A. Yes.</p> <p>10 Q. Do you know who Mr. Klos is?</p> <p>11 A. I do.</p> <p>12 Q. And who do you understand Mr. Klos</p> <p>13 to be? What role did he play in May of 2019?</p> <p>14 A. I don't know.</p> <p>15 I know he worked under Frank.</p> <p>16 Q. He worked out of -- do you see</p> <p>17 there's an e-mail to a corporate accounting</p> <p>18 group?</p> <p>19 A. Yes.</p> <p>20 Q. Have you ever sent or received an</p> <p>21 e-mail from a Highland corporate accounting</p> <p>22 e-mail chain called the corporate accounting</p> <p>23 group?</p> <p>24 A. I've never sent an e-mail from the</p> <p>25 corporate accounting group.</p>	<p>Page 27</p> <p>1 D. Sauter</p> <p>2 I can't recall receiving one from</p> <p>3 them either.</p> <p>4 Q. Do you see that in this e-mail</p> <p>5 Mr. Klos asks to have \$2.4 million transferred</p> <p>6 from HCMLP to HCMFA?</p> <p>7 A. I do.</p> <p>8 Q. And do you see that he states:</p> <p>9 "This is a new interco loan"?</p> <p>10 A. I do.</p> <p>11 Q. And if we can see the response</p> <p>12 above, do you see how Ms. -- do you know</p> <p>13 Kristin Hendrix?</p> <p>14 A. I do.</p> <p>15 Q. And who is Ms. Hendrix, to the best</p> <p>16 of your knowledge.</p> <p>17 A. I believe she worked under Mr. Klos.</p> <p>18 Q. And do you see that she wrote to</p> <p>19 someone named Blair and attached a copy of a</p> <p>20 note?</p> <p>21 A. Yes.</p> <p>22 Q. Okay.</p> <p>23 A. That's what it says.</p> <p>24 Q. And can we go to the next page,</p> <p>25 please.</p>
<p>Page 28</p> <p>1 D. Sauter</p> <p>2 And do you see that this is a</p> <p>3 promissory note for \$2.4 million dated May 2,</p> <p>4 2019?</p> <p>5 A. I do.</p> <p>6 Q. Okay. And can we go to the</p> <p>7 signature line.</p> <p>8 Do you see Mr. Waterhouse's</p> <p>9 signature?</p> <p>10 Do you see Mr. Waterhouse's</p> <p>11 signature, sir?</p> <p>12 A. I can't verify whether that's his</p> <p>13 signature, but I'll take your word for it.</p> <p>14 Q. Okay. Can you go to the top of the</p> <p>15 note, please.</p> <p>16 Do you see that the maker is defined</p> <p>17 to be Highland Capital Management Fund</p> <p>18 Advisors, LP?</p> <p>19 A. I do see that that's what it says on</p> <p>20 the first page.</p> <p>21 Q. Okay. And this is one of the two</p> <p>22 notes that was the source of your</p> <p>23 investigation. Right? This was one of the two</p> <p>24 notes that you were investigating the origins</p> <p>25 of?</p>	<p>Page 29</p> <p>1 D. Sauter</p> <p>2 A. Yes.</p> <p>3 Q. Okay. Let's look at the next note,</p> <p>4 please.</p> <p>5 (Exhibit 57, Promissory Note dated</p> <p>6 5/3/19, D-CNL003764-65, previously marked for</p> <p>7 identification.)</p> <p>8 Do you see this is a note for</p> <p>9 \$5 million and it's dated the next day,</p> <p>10 May 3rd, 2019?</p> <p>11 A. I see that.</p> <p>12 Q. Do you see that it's -- it also</p> <p>13 defines as the maker Highland Capital</p> <p>14 Management Fund Advisors, LP?</p> <p>15 A. That's what it says on the first</p> <p>16 page, yes.</p> <p>17 Q. Okay. And if we can go to the</p> <p>18 signature line.</p> <p>19 Again, does that appear to be</p> <p>20 Mr. Waterhouse's signature?</p> <p>21 A. Again, I can't verify whether that's</p> <p>22 Mr. Waterhouse's signature or not.</p> <p>23 But it does say that the maker is</p> <p>24 Frank Waterhouse, not Highland Capital</p> <p>25 Management Fund Advisors.</p>

<p>Page 30</p> <p>1 D. Sauter</p> <p>2 Q. I understand.</p> <p>3 But the definition of "maker" is</p> <p>4 above. Correct?</p> <p>5 A. I wouldn't -- that's not how I would</p> <p>6 draft a promissory note.</p> <p>7 Q. I didn't ask you how you would draft</p> <p>8 it.</p> <p>9 I'm just asking you whether, having</p> <p>10 just looked at the document and as a lawyer</p> <p>11 admitted to practice in law, would you agree</p> <p>12 that the term "maker" is a defined term in this</p> <p>13 document?</p> <p>14 MR. RUKAVINA: I'll just object to</p> <p>15 form here and also that this witness has not</p> <p>16 been called as an expert, even though he's a</p> <p>17 lawyer.</p> <p>18 So I'll just preserve that for the</p> <p>19 record.</p> <p>20 MR. MORRIS: Fair. That's fine.</p> <p>21 THE WITNESS: I would agree that</p> <p>22 "maker" is defined on the first page, but that</p> <p>23 would be an improper signature block, if it was</p> <p>24 intended to be Highland Capital Management Fund</p> <p>25 Advisors.</p>	<p>Page 31</p> <p>1 D. Sauter</p> <p>2 BY MR. MORRIS:</p> <p>3 Q. All right. We're going to refer to</p> <p>4 these two notes collectively as "the notes."</p> <p>5 Is that okay?</p> <p>6 A. That's fine.</p> <p>7 Q. And these are the two notes that you</p> <p>8 were investigating. Right?</p> <p>9 A. Yes.</p> <p>10 Q. And it's your understanding that</p> <p>11 these are the two notes that Highland Capital</p> <p>12 Management is suing to collect on. Right?</p> <p>13 A. Yes.</p> <p>14 Q. Okay. According to your</p> <p>15 declaration, if we can go to Paragraph 13, if</p> <p>16 we can put that back up on the screen, as part</p> <p>17 of the initial investigation -- withdrawn.</p> <p>18 I'm going to use the phrase "initial</p> <p>19 investigation" to mean the investigation that</p> <p>20 you conducted between the time the complaint</p> <p>21 was filed and the time that HCMFA filed its</p> <p>22 original answer on March 1st.</p> <p>23 Is that okay?</p> <p>24 A. Sure.</p> <p>25 Q. And during that initial</p>
<p>Page 32</p> <p>1 D. Sauter</p> <p>2 investigation, you spoke with Jim Dondero.</p> <p>3 Correct?</p> <p>4 A. I did.</p> <p>5 Q. Okay. And according to</p> <p>6 Paragraph 13, he couldn't recall the genesis of</p> <p>7 the notes. Is that right?</p> <p>8 A. That's correct.</p> <p>9 Q. Did you show him the notes?</p> <p>10 A. I don't recall.</p> <p>11 Q. Did you tell him that the notes were</p> <p>12 dated May 2nd and May 3rd, 2019?</p> <p>13 A. I don't recall that either.</p> <p>14 Q. Did you do anything to try to</p> <p>15 refresh his recollection about the timing of</p> <p>16 the notes?</p> <p>17 A. I'm sure I did.</p> <p>18 But I don't recall that conversation</p> <p>19 in any detail as I'm sitting here today.</p> <p>20 Q. Did you tell him the principal</p> <p>21 amount of the notes?</p> <p>22 A. Yes.</p> <p>23 Q. And even though you told him the</p> <p>24 principal amount of the notes, he still had no</p> <p>25 recollection as to what they related to. Is</p>	<p>Page 33</p> <p>1 D. Sauter</p> <p>2 that right?</p> <p>3 A. He couldn't recall the genesis,</p> <p>4 correct.</p> <p>5 Q. Did he have any recollection at all</p> <p>6 as to what the notes related to?</p> <p>7 A. I don't -- I don't believe so,</p> <p>8 because if he had, then I would have been able</p> <p>9 to pin it down further.</p> <p>10 Q. How many conversations did you have</p> <p>11 with Mr. Dondero as part of your initial</p> <p>12 investigation?</p> <p>13 A. I don't recall.</p> <p>14 Two, three.</p> <p>15 Q. Was there anybody present other than</p> <p>16 the two of you?</p> <p>17 A. Again, I don't recall.</p> <p>18 Q. Do you recall if they took place on</p> <p>19 the phone or were they in person?</p> <p>20 A. It would have been in person.</p> <p>21 Q. And why do you say it would have</p> <p>22 been in person?</p> <p>23 A. Well, now that you say that, no, it</p> <p>24 probably wasn't in person because he would not</p> <p>25 have been in the office at that time.</p>

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 34</p> <p>1 D. Sauter</p> <p>2 There was obviously a lot of things</p> <p>3 going on at this point. Mr. Dondero had been</p> <p>4 evicted from the building, and so that made --</p> <p>5 I shouldn't say evicted. He'd been kicked out</p> <p>6 by the debtor, and so that made our</p> <p>7 communications a little more difficult.</p> <p>8 So I would have spoken with him on</p> <p>9 the phone because I did not go over to the</p> <p>10 NexBank office very often.</p> <p>11 Q. Paragraph 13 says that you also</p> <p>12 spoke with "the few employees of HCMFA."</p> <p>13 Do you see that in the middle of the</p> <p>14 paragraph?</p> <p>15 A. Yes.</p> <p>16 Q. Can you identify the other CMFA</p> <p>17 employees that you spoke with as part of your</p> <p>18 initial investigation?</p> <p>19 A. I would have spoken with Dustin</p> <p>20 Norris and --</p> <p>21 Q. Do you recall speaking -- I</p> <p>22 apologize for interrupting.</p> <p>23 Go ahead.</p> <p>24 A. And so he wasn't an HCMFA employee,</p> <p>25 but Jason Post.</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 35</p> <p>1 D. Sauter</p> <p>2 Q. Do you have a recollection of</p> <p>3 speaking to Mr. Norris, or are you just</p> <p>4 surmising that you probably did?</p> <p>5 A. I'm surmising that I probably would</p> <p>6 have.</p> <p>7 There was a lot, again, that was</p> <p>8 happening. I didn't have the historical</p> <p>9 knowledge of these things, and so I talked with</p> <p>10 Mr. Post and Mr. Norris daily about everything</p> <p>11 that was going on just to get some background</p> <p>12 on all of the moving parts.</p> <p>13 Q. Okay. Do you know if Mr. Norris</p> <p>14 held any position with HCMFA in 2019?</p> <p>15 A. I don't -- I don't know for certain.</p> <p>16 I believe he did.</p> <p>17 I can't recall what his position</p> <p>18 would have been.</p> <p>19 Q. Does he have a position with HCMFA</p> <p>20 today, to the best of your knowledge?</p> <p>21 A. I believe he does.</p> <p>22 Q. And what do you understand his</p> <p>23 position to be?</p> <p>24 A. I would say vice president.</p> <p>25 Q. Do you know when he became vice</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 36</p> <p>1 D. Sauter</p> <p>2 president of HCMFA?</p> <p>3 A. I do not.</p> <p>4 Q. Do you know if he was vice president</p> <p>5 of HCMFA in October 2020?</p> <p>6 A. I do not.</p> <p>7 Q. Do you know if Mr. Norris holds any</p> <p>8 positions with DAF -- I'm sorry.</p> <p>9 Do you know if Mr. Norris holds any</p> <p>10 positions with GAF?</p> <p>11 A. I don't know.</p> <p>12 Q. How about Mr. Post? Do you know if</p> <p>13 Mr. Post held any positions with HCMFA in 2019?</p> <p>14 A. I don't.</p> <p>15 Q. Do you know if he holds any</p> <p>16 positions with HCMFA today?</p> <p>17 A. He does not.</p> <p>18 Q. Is Mr. Post a compliance officer, to</p> <p>19 the best of your knowledge?</p> <p>20 A. He was.</p> <p>21 He left a week ago to take another</p> <p>22 job.</p> <p>23 Q. So he was -- and who did he -- for</p> <p>24 whom did he serve as the chief compliance</p> <p>25 officer until a week ago?</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 37</p> <p>1 D. Sauter</p> <p>2 A. He was chief compliance officer for</p> <p>3 Nexpoint Advisors.</p> <p>4 He may have been the chief</p> <p>5 compliance officer for HCMFA as well.</p> <p>6 Q. Okay.</p> <p>7 A. And if I had to guess, he would have</p> <p>8 had those same positions back in 2019 --</p> <p>9 Q. Okay.</p> <p>10 A. -- because Thomas Surgent was the</p> <p>11 chief compliance officer for HCMFA and Jason</p> <p>12 worked under him.</p> <p>13 And I think that started sometime in</p> <p>14 2014, maybe earlier.</p> <p>15 Q. And did Mr. Norris and Mr. Post tell</p> <p>16 you during your initial investigation that they</p> <p>17 had no knowledge of the notes?</p> <p>18 A. Yeah, generally I don't think that</p> <p>19 they were aware of the notes, or I should say</p> <p>20 they weren't aware of the genesis of the notes.</p> <p>21 Q. Were they aware of the existence of</p> <p>22 the notes?</p> <p>23 A. They were.</p> <p>24 Q. Did they tell you when they had</p> <p>25 learned of the existence of the notes?</p>

<p>Page 38</p> <p>1 D. Sauter</p> <p>2 A. I think it's something that I raised</p> <p>3 to them because I didn't know where the notes</p> <p>4 had come from.</p> <p>5 Q. Right.</p> <p>6 And they told you that they were</p> <p>7 aware of the notes but they didn't know the</p> <p>8 genesis of them?</p> <p>9 A. I don't recall whether they were</p> <p>10 aware of the notes before I asked about them.</p> <p>11 Q. Did you ask them if they were aware</p> <p>12 of the notes prior to the time you showed it to</p> <p>13 them?</p> <p>14 A. I would have asked them what the</p> <p>15 notes were about.</p> <p>16 Q. I don't want to know what you would</p> <p>17 have done.</p> <p>18 I know this is hard, Mr. Sauter.</p> <p>19 I'm really just asking you to search your</p> <p>20 memory.</p> <p>21 Do you recall asking them whether</p> <p>22 they were aware of the existence of the notes</p> <p>23 prior to your conversation with them?</p> <p>24 A. I don't recall if I asked whether</p> <p>25 they were aware of the existence of the notes</p>	<p>Page 39</p> <p>1 D. Sauter</p> <p>2 prior to my conversation with them.</p> <p>3 Q. Now, Paragraph 13 says that</p> <p>4 Mr. Dondero could not recall the genesis of the</p> <p>5 notes.</p> <p>6 Do you see that?</p> <p>7 A. Yes.</p> <p>8 Q. Did Mr. Dondero indicate to you that</p> <p>9 he was aware of the existence of the notes even</p> <p>10 though he couldn't recall the genesis of the</p> <p>11 notes?</p> <p>12 A. That's not how I would characterize</p> <p>13 it, but...</p> <p>14 Q. How would you characterize it?</p> <p>15 A. He suggested that I talk to</p> <p>16 Mr. Waterhouse.</p> <p>17 Q. Did you ask Mr. Dondero when he</p> <p>18 first learned of the existence of the notes?</p> <p>19 A. No.</p> <p>20 Q. Did he say to you anything that</p> <p>21 caused you to believe that he was unaware of</p> <p>22 the existence of the notes prior to the</p> <p>23 commencement of the lawsuit?</p> <p>24 A. No.</p> <p>25 I guess let me clarify.</p>
<p>Page 40</p> <p>1 D. Sauter</p> <p>2 He didn't make any comments that</p> <p>3 made me think one way or the other.</p> <p>4 Q. And you didn't ask.</p> <p>5 Is that fair?</p> <p>6 A. Correct, I did not ask.</p> <p>7 Q. So you had no information as to</p> <p>8 whether or not Mr. Dondero actually knew of the</p> <p>9 existence of the notes prior to the</p> <p>10 commencement of the lawsuit.</p> <p>11 Is that fair?</p> <p>12 A. Correct.</p> <p>13 Q. Okay. Paragraph 13 also states that</p> <p>14 you reviewed limited books and records of</p> <p>15 HCMFA.</p> <p>16 Do you see that?</p> <p>17 A. Yes.</p> <p>18 Q. Okay. What books and records did</p> <p>19 you review as part of your initial</p> <p>20 investigation?</p> <p>21 A. I don't recall exactly what I looked</p> <p>22 at or for.</p> <p>23 I literally had to just go onto the</p> <p>24 system and try to find anything that related to</p> <p>25 the notes so I could try to find out what they</p>	<p>Page 41</p> <p>1 D. Sauter</p> <p>2 were.</p> <p>3 Q. Did you make any effort to try to</p> <p>4 determine whether HCMFA had accounted for the</p> <p>5 notes in its books and records?</p> <p>6 A. I did not.</p> <p>7 Q. Do you know today whether HCMFA ever</p> <p>8 accounted for the notes in its books and</p> <p>9 records?</p> <p>10 A. I don't know.</p> <p>11 Q. Have you ever reviewed HCMFA's</p> <p>12 balance sheets?</p> <p>13 A. I think I have, but I don't -- I</p> <p>14 can't recall exactly when.</p> <p>15 Q. Did you ever make any effort to</p> <p>16 determine whether HCMFA carried these notes on</p> <p>17 its balance sheet as liabilities?</p> <p>18 A. I did not.</p> <p>19 Q. Do you know if HCMFA ever requested</p> <p>20 an extension of time to respond to the</p> <p>21 complaint?</p> <p>22 A. I don't know, but I would assume so.</p> <p>23 Q. Okay. Do you have any knowledge of</p> <p>24 HCMFA having done so?</p> <p>25 A. No.</p>

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 42</p> <p>1 D. Sauter</p> <p>2 Q. Okay. Do you know if -- prior to</p> <p>3 the time it filed its original answer, whether</p> <p>4 HCMFA ever asked HCMLP to provide any documents</p> <p>5 in connection with the adversary proceeding?</p> <p>6 A. Say that again.</p> <p>7 Q. Sure.</p> <p>8 So HCMFA filed its answer on</p> <p>9 March 1st, according to Paragraph 12.</p> <p>10 Do I have that right?</p> <p>11 A. I believe that's right.</p> <p>12 Q. Okay. Do you know if HCMFA ever</p> <p>13 asked Highland for any documents before it</p> <p>14 filed its answer?</p> <p>15 A. I don't recall.</p> <p>16 Q. So at the time HCMFA filed its</p> <p>17 answer, Mr. Dondero couldn't recall the genesis</p> <p>18 of the notes. Correct?</p> <p>19 A. That's right.</p> <p>20 Q. And neither Mr. Post nor Mr. Norris</p> <p>21 could recall the genesis of the notes.</p> <p>22 Correct?</p> <p>23 A. Correct.</p> <p>24 Q. And HCMFA had limited access to</p> <p>25 books and records. Correct?</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 43</p> <p>1 D. Sauter</p> <p>2 A. Correct.</p> <p>3 Q. And HCMFA had no access to the</p> <p>4 debtor's employees who had provided services to</p> <p>5 HCMFA under shared services agreements.</p> <p>6 Correct?</p> <p>7 A. I think our view was it was</p> <p>8 potentially improper to reach out to those</p> <p>9 employees on a matter that was adverse to</p> <p>10 HCMLP, and so we refrained from doing so.</p> <p>11 Q. Okay. And so under those</p> <p>12 circumstances, HCMFA nevertheless filed an</p> <p>13 answer that asserted no affirmative defenses.</p> <p>14 Correct?</p> <p>15 A. Yes.</p> <p>16 Q. But this situation changed in</p> <p>17 mid-April 2001. Correct?</p> <p>18 A. Yes.</p> <p>19 Q. If we can scroll down to</p> <p>20 Paragraph 19.</p> <p>21 (Discussion was held off the</p> <p>22 record.)</p> <p>23 Q. So in April 2001, the situation</p> <p>24 changed because Mr. Waterhouse and other former</p> <p>25 employees of Highland had migrated over to</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 44</p> <p>1 D. Sauter</p> <p>2 Skyview so that you had access to them. Is</p> <p>3 that right?</p> <p>4 A. Correct.</p> <p>5 Q. And that's when you conducted the</p> <p>6 second phase of your investigation. Correct?</p> <p>7 A. Yes.</p> <p>8 Q. And you'll see at the end of Page 4</p> <p>9 you reference that the debtor had provided</p> <p>10 access to HCMFA of much of its books and</p> <p>11 records.</p> <p>12 Do I have that right?</p> <p>13 A. Yes.</p> <p>14 Q. Okay. And what books and records</p> <p>15 did Highland provide between March 1st and</p> <p>16 mid-April when you conducted the second phase</p> <p>17 of your investigation?</p> <p>18 Are there any particular books and</p> <p>19 records that you're referring to in that</p> <p>20 sentence?</p> <p>21 A. I can't recall exactly what it was.</p> <p>22 There was a process that we were</p> <p>23 going through that I think -- if you'll recall,</p> <p>24 that we went back and forth on obtaining access</p> <p>25 to books and records, submitting written</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 45</p> <p>1 D. Sauter</p> <p>2 requests, and those were either granted or</p> <p>3 denied. And so there were a litany of</p> <p>4 documents that were sent over.</p> <p>5 Q. Can you identify any documents that</p> <p>6 you reviewed as part of either the initial</p> <p>7 investigation or the follow-up investigation in</p> <p>8 April 2021?</p> <p>9 A. Yes.</p> <p>10 I would have reviewed documents</p> <p>11 related to the TerreStar NAV error.</p> <p>12 Q. And can you describe what those</p> <p>13 documents are.</p> <p>14 A. Memos.</p> <p>15 Q. Okay. Do you recall how many memos</p> <p>16 you reviewed that concerned the TerreStar NAV</p> <p>17 issue?</p> <p>18 A. I want to say that there were three,</p> <p>19 four or five, something along those lines.</p> <p>20 I think there was a memo that was</p> <p>21 submitted to the board and then maybe some</p> <p>22 communications with the SEC.</p> <p>23 Q. And is it your testimony that HCMFA</p> <p>24 did not have those memos until after March 1st,</p> <p>25 2021?</p>

<p>Page 46</p> <p>1 D. Sauter</p> <p>2 A. I don't know whether we had access</p> <p>3 to those memos, but I didn't -- I wasn't able</p> <p>4 to speak to Frank Waterhouse, and so I didn't</p> <p>5 know to look for them.</p> <p>6 Q. And neither Mr. Dondero nor</p> <p>7 Mr. Norris nor Mr. Post thought to inform you</p> <p>8 about the NAV star error [sic] because they had</p> <p>9 no idea what the notes related to. Correct?</p> <p>10 A. That's my recollection. That's</p> <p>11 correct.</p> <p>12 Q. Okay. Other than the three to five</p> <p>13 memos that you've just described, are there any</p> <p>14 other documents that you recall reviewing as</p> <p>15 part of your investigation?</p> <p>16 A. No.</p> <p>17 Q. Do you know to whom the memos that</p> <p>18 you've just described were addressed?</p> <p>19 Who were they sent to?</p> <p>20 A. I believe there was one that was</p> <p>21 sent to the board.</p> <p>22 And then the others, I think, were</p> <p>23 just either internal communications or</p> <p>24 communications with the SEC.</p> <p>25 Q. Can we scroll down to Paragraph 22,</p>	<p>Page 47</p> <p>1 D. Sauter</p> <p>2 please.</p> <p>3 Actually, look at Paragraph 21</p> <p>4 first.</p> <p>5 According to Paragraph 21, as part</p> <p>6 of the second phase of your investigation, you</p> <p>7 spoke with Mr. Waterhouse and Mr. Mabry.</p> <p>8 Correct?</p> <p>9 A. Yes.</p> <p>10 Q. Did you speak with anybody else as</p> <p>11 part of the second phase of your investigation?</p> <p>12 A. Yes, I would have spoken with Jason</p> <p>13 Post and Dustin Norris.</p> <p>14 Q. And is it fair to say based on the</p> <p>15 second phase of your -- withdrawn.</p> <p>16 Is it fair to say that your</p> <p>17 conclusions that resulted from the second phase</p> <p>18 of your investigation are set forth in</p> <p>19 Paragraph 22?</p> <p>20 A. (Reviewing document.)</p> <p>21 I wouldn't say all of my</p> <p>22 conclusions. But yes, that's some of them.</p> <p>23 Q. Okay. Is it fair to say that, based</p> <p>24 on the second phase of your investigation, you</p> <p>25 concluded, among other things, "that the notes</p>
<p>Page 48</p> <p>1 D. Sauter</p> <p>2 were signed by mistake by Waterhouse without</p> <p>3 authority from HCMFA"?</p> <p>4 A. Yes.</p> <p>5 Q. Okay. Let's talk about your</p> <p>6 discussions with Mr. Waterhouse as part of your</p> <p>7 investigation.</p> <p>8 How many times did you speak with</p> <p>9 him?</p> <p>10 A. Probably three.</p> <p>11 Q. And was anybody else present for any</p> <p>12 of the three conversations?</p> <p>13 A. I don't recall. I don't think so.</p> <p>14 Q. Did you take any notes of your</p> <p>15 conversations with Mr. Waterhouse?</p> <p>16 A. I don't recall.</p> <p>17 Q. Do you recall whether you sent</p> <p>18 anybody any e-mails summarizing your</p> <p>19 conversations with Mr. Waterhouse?</p> <p>20 A. I don't recall.</p> <p>21 Q. Did the three conversations take</p> <p>22 place in person, on the phone or some mix</p> <p>23 thereof?</p> <p>24 A. I think it would have been a mix</p> <p>25 thereof.</p>	<p>Page 49</p> <p>1 D. Sauter</p> <p>2 Q. Do you recall which of the three</p> <p>3 conversations was the longest, which was the</p> <p>4 shortest?</p> <p>5 I just want to get a sense of how</p> <p>6 much time you spent with Mr. Waterhouse.</p> <p>7 A. I don't, because again, there was</p> <p>8 lots going on.</p> <p>9 The first one was in the conference</p> <p>10 room on the 11th floor at NexBank. The second</p> <p>11 one was in his office. And I think the third</p> <p>12 was on a phone call.</p> <p>13 Q. Did any of them last more than ten</p> <p>14 minutes?</p> <p>15 A. I can't say for certain.</p> <p>16 I would think so, but...</p> <p>17 Q. Okay. Did you show Mr. Waterhouse</p> <p>18 either of the notes as part of either of these</p> <p>19 three interviews?</p> <p>20 A. I don't recall if I did.</p> <p>21 But he knew -- he knew the notes.</p> <p>22 Q. And what did he say to you that led</p> <p>23 you to believe that he knew the notes?</p> <p>24 A. Because he was aware of the notes.</p> <p>25 I...</p>

<p>Page 50</p> <p>1 D. Sauter</p> <p>2 Q. Did he tell the circumstances</p> <p>3 surrounding the execution of the notes?</p> <p>4 A. Yes.</p> <p>5 Q. What did he tell you?</p> <p>6 A. He said those notes were executed in</p> <p>7 connection with the TerreStar NAV error.</p> <p>8 Q. During your discussions with</p> <p>9 Mr. Waterhouse, did he ever deny signing the</p> <p>10 notes?</p> <p>11 A. No.</p> <p>12 Q. He never told you that he was</p> <p>13 unaware of the existence of the notes, did he?</p> <p>14 A. No.</p> <p>15 Q. In fact, before signing your</p> <p>16 declaration, you believed Mr. Waterhouse in</p> <p>17 fact had signed the notes. Correct?</p> <p>18 A. Yes.</p> <p>19 Q. And that's why in Paragraph 22 you</p> <p>20 specifically wrote that the notes were signed</p> <p>21 by mistake by Waterhouse. Right?</p> <p>22 A. Yes.</p> <p>23 Q. And you understood at the time you</p> <p>24 signed your declaration that Mr. Waterhouse had</p> <p>25 signed the notes at a time when he was HCMFA's</p>	<p>Page 51</p> <p>1 D. Sauter</p> <p>2 chief financial officer. Correct?</p> <p>3 A. I don't think I said that, but that</p> <p>4 would have been my assumption.</p> <p>5 Q. Okay. I think if we can -- give me</p> <p>6 just one moment. I think I...</p> <p>7 Can we go to Paragraph 29, please.</p> <p>8 You'll see, according to your</p> <p>9 declaration, it says: "Returning to the notes,</p> <p>10 Waterhouse was the chief financial officer of</p> <p>11 both the debtor and the HCMFA during the above</p> <p>12 events and at the time he signed the notes."</p> <p>13 Have I read that correctly?</p> <p>14 A. You did.</p> <p>15 Q. Does that refresh your recollection</p> <p>16 that at the time you signed this declaration</p> <p>17 you believed that Mr. Waterhouse was HCMFA's</p> <p>18 CFO at the time he signed the notes?</p> <p>19 A. It does.</p> <p>20 Q. Okay. During your investigation did</p> <p>21 Mr. Waterhouse ever tell you that he signed the</p> <p>22 notes by mistake?</p> <p>23 A. No.</p> <p>24 Q. Did you ever ask Mr. Waterhouse</p> <p>25 during your investigation whether he signed the</p>
<p>Page 52</p> <p>1 D. Sauter</p> <p>2 notes by mistake?</p> <p>3 A. I guess I'd like to clarify that</p> <p>4 response, if I may.</p> <p>5 Q. Go right ahead.</p> <p>6 A. I asked Mr. Waterhouse why he would</p> <p>7 have signed it -- the notes in his personal</p> <p>8 capacity.</p> <p>9 And his response was, I don't know,</p> <p>10 I didn't prepare them.</p> <p>11 So I don't know if that gives you</p> <p>12 the answer you're looking for, but there was</p> <p>13 some confusion about the execution of those</p> <p>14 notes.</p> <p>15 Q. Okay. Did he say anything else</p> <p>16 that -- on the topic of whether signing the</p> <p>17 notes was a mistake?</p> <p>18 A. No.</p> <p>19 Q. Okay. Your declaration doesn't</p> <p>20 disclose what you just described for me.</p> <p>21 Correct?</p> <p>22 A. Not in those exact words, no.</p> <p>23 Q. Is there anything in your</p> <p>24 declaration that suggests that Mr. Waterhouse</p> <p>25 hadn't signed the notes?</p>	<p>Page 53</p> <p>1 D. Sauter</p> <p>2 A. I don't think there's anything else</p> <p>3 in my declaration from --</p> <p>4 Q. Okay. There's nothing --</p> <p>5 (Simultaneous crosstalk.)</p> <p>6 Q. I apologize.</p> <p>7 A. -- from May that would suggest that</p> <p>8 Mr. Waterhouse didn't sign the notes.</p> <p>9 Q. There's nothing in here, in your</p> <p>10 declaration, that states that Mr. Waterhouse</p> <p>11 admitted that he made a mistake in signing the</p> <p>12 notes. Correct?</p> <p>13 A. Correct.</p> <p>14 Q. There's nothing in your declaration</p> <p>15 that suggests that Mr. Waterhouse in fact did</p> <p>16 not sign or did not authorize the signing of</p> <p>17 his signature to these notes. Correct?</p> <p>18 A. Correct, because he told me he did.</p> <p>19 Q. Okay. And Mr. -- he told you that</p> <p>20 he had signed the notes. Correct?</p> <p>21 A. Yes.</p> <p>22 He said that he didn't use his</p> <p>23 electronic signature then, and if his signature</p> <p>24 was on them, it would have been his.</p> <p>25 Q. Okay. Mr. Waterhouse never filed</p>

<p>Page 54</p> <p>1 D. Sauter</p> <p>2 his own declaration in support of HCMFA's</p> <p>3 motion for leave to amend their answer.</p> <p>4 Correct?</p> <p>5 A. Correct.</p> <p>6 Q. During your investigation did you</p> <p>7 ask Mr. Waterhouse if he had authority to sign</p> <p>8 the notes?</p> <p>9 A. Probably not in those exact words.</p> <p>10 Q. Okay. Did you ask him in form or</p> <p>11 substance whether he was authorized to sign the</p> <p>12 notes?</p> <p>13 A. Yes.</p> <p>14 Q. And what did he say?</p> <p>15 A. I think he -- well, his response was</p> <p>16 if he signed them, he was authorized to sign</p> <p>17 them.</p> <p>18 Q. Okay. And Mr. Waterhouse never told</p> <p>19 you that he signed the notes without authority.</p> <p>20 Correct?</p> <p>21 A. He told me that -- I asked him if</p> <p>22 Mr. Dondero had approved the notes.</p> <p>23 And I don't think he could recall.</p> <p>24 Q. Okay. Did Mr. Waterhouse ever tell</p> <p>25 you that he signed the notes without authority?</p>	<p>Page 55</p> <p>1 D. Sauter</p> <p>2 A. No.</p> <p>3 Q. Okay. Your declaration certainly</p> <p>4 doesn't say that Mr. Waterhouse admitted</p> <p>5 signing the notes without authority. Correct?</p> <p>6 A. Correct.</p> <p>7 Q. Mr. Waterhouse never filed a</p> <p>8 declaration in this case stating that he had</p> <p>9 filed the notes without authority. Correct?</p> <p>10 A. Correct.</p> <p>11 Q. Are you aware that Mr. Waterhouse</p> <p>12 was deposed in this case?</p> <p>13 A. I'm -- yes, I'm aware.</p> <p>14 Q. Have you reviewed his deposition</p> <p>15 transcript?</p> <p>16 A. I have not.</p> <p>17 Q. Has his testimony been described for</p> <p>18 you by anybody?</p> <p>19 MR. RUKAVINA: And I'll just caution</p> <p>20 you, Mr. Sauter. You know, I think that's a</p> <p>21 yes or no answer, but don't go into the</p> <p>22 substance of any discussions with me.</p> <p>23 THE WITNESS: Yes. Okay.</p> <p>24 Yes.</p> <p>25</p>
<p>Page 56</p> <p>1 D. Sauter</p> <p>2 BY MR. MORRIS:</p> <p>3 Q. All right. Are you aware that he</p> <p>4 testified that nobody has ever told him that he</p> <p>5 made a mistake in signing the notes?</p> <p>6 MR. RUKAVINA: Objection, form.</p> <p>7 THE WITNESS: I'm not.</p> <p>8 Q. Are you aware of anybody in the</p> <p>9 world ever telling Mr. Waterhouse that he made</p> <p>10 a mistake in signing the notes?</p> <p>11 A. Yes.</p> <p>12 Q. And who told him that?</p> <p>13 A. Me.</p> <p>14 Q. And when did you tell him that?</p> <p>15 A. When we had this discussion.</p> <p>16 Q. Okay. So it's your testimony that</p> <p>17 you actually told Mr. Waterhouse that he made a</p> <p>18 mistake in signing the notes. Right?</p> <p>19 A. I asked him who had approved these</p> <p>20 notes and what was the process.</p> <p>21 And he said he couldn't give me any</p> <p>22 process. He said the money was transferred,</p> <p>23 and so we signed the notes.</p> <p>24 Q. Okay. But did you tell him that he</p> <p>25 made a mistake?</p>	<p>Page 57</p> <p>1 D. Sauter</p> <p>2 A. I think I implied it.</p> <p>3 Q. Do you have a recollection of</p> <p>4 actually telling him that he made a mistake?</p> <p>5 A. That would be my recollection.</p> <p>6 Obviously he disagrees with it.</p> <p>7 Q. Do you know if any -- and on what</p> <p>8 basis did you conclude that he made a mistake?</p> <p>9 Withdrawn.</p> <p>10 You have no personal knowledge of</p> <p>11 anything that happened in connection with the</p> <p>12 TerreStar valuation issue. Correct?</p> <p>13 A. I was not personally involved in the</p> <p>14 TerreStar valuation issue, correct.</p> <p>15 Q. You weren't involved in any of the</p> <p>16 decisions that were made in connection with the</p> <p>17 TerreStar valuation. Correct?</p> <p>18 A. Correct.</p> <p>19 Q. You weren't made -- you weren't</p> <p>20 involved and had no responsibility for HCMFA's</p> <p>21 response to the SEC. Correct?</p> <p>22 A. Correct.</p> <p>23 Q. You had no responsibility or</p> <p>24 involvement in the decision as to how HCMFA was</p> <p>25 going to fund the losses to the GAF. Correct?</p>

<p>Page 58</p> <p>1 D. Sauter</p> <p>2 A. Correct.</p> <p>3 Q. You had no responsibility or</p> <p>4 involvement in how HCMFA reported to GAF.</p> <p>5 Correct?</p> <p>6 A. Correct.</p> <p>7 Q. But nevertheless, despite having no</p> <p>8 personal knowledge of those issues, you told</p> <p>9 Mr. Waterhouse or implied to Mr. Waterhouse</p> <p>10 that he made a mistake in executing the notes.</p> <p>11 Correct?</p> <p>12 A. Correct.</p> <p>13 Q. What did Mr. Waterhouse say in</p> <p>14 response?</p> <p>15 A. Not much. He just disagreed.</p> <p>16 Q. Did he just say, I disagree, and</p> <p>17 that's it or did he actually -- do you recall</p> <p>18 anything specific that he said?</p> <p>19 A. I think I've already testified he</p> <p>20 said, we transferred the money, so I executed</p> <p>21 the notes. HCMFA didn't have the money to pay</p> <p>22 GAF, and so we transferred it from HCMLP and I</p> <p>23 executed the notes.</p> <p>24 Q. Okay. Your declaration doesn't</p> <p>25 attribute any specific statements to</p>	<p>Page 59</p> <p>1 D. Sauter</p> <p>2 Mr. Waterhouse, does it?</p> <p>3 A. It does not.</p> <p>4 Q. In fact, your declaration is just --</p> <p>5 withdrawn.</p> <p>6 If we can go to Paragraph 30.</p> <p>7 Take a look at Paragraph 30. We'll</p> <p>8 kind of parse it through.</p> <p>9 The first sentence says: "It</p> <p>10 appears clear that Mr. Waterhouse made a</p> <p>11 mistake."</p> <p>12 Do you see that?</p> <p>13 A. Yes.</p> <p>14 Q. But again, Mr. Waterhouse never</p> <p>15 admitted to making a mistake. Correct?</p> <p>16 A. Correct.</p> <p>17 Q. And this is your -- this is a</p> <p>18 conclusion that you're reaching in May of 2021,</p> <p>19 more than two years after the fact. Correct?</p> <p>20 A. Based upon my review of the</p> <p>21 documents and my discussions with Mr. Post and</p> <p>22 Mr. Norris.</p> <p>23 Q. Did you ever have any discussions</p> <p>24 with Mr. Dondero in May of 2021 as you were</p> <p>25 preparing this document?</p>
<p>Page 60</p> <p>1 D. Sauter</p> <p>2 A. Did I have any discussions with him</p> <p>3 about this?</p> <p>4 Q. I apologize. That was a bad</p> <p>5 question.</p> <p>6 Did you discuss in May of 2021 the</p> <p>7 issues concerning the notes with Mr. Dondero,</p> <p>8 or was that just part of the initial</p> <p>9 investigation?</p> <p>10 A. I don't recall.</p> <p>11 Q. And then a couple of lines down, you</p> <p>12 say -- you wrote: "It appears that</p> <p>13 Mr. Waterhouse assumed incorrectly that the</p> <p>14 funds being paid by the debtor were a loan to</p> <p>15 HCMFA."</p> <p>16 Do you see that?</p> <p>17 A. Yes.</p> <p>18 Q. Did you ask Mr. Waterhouse if he</p> <p>19 actually made the assumption that you're</p> <p>20 attributing to him?</p> <p>21 A. Yes.</p> <p>22 Q. And did he ever admit that the</p> <p>23 assumption was incorrect?</p> <p>24 A. He did not admit that the assumption</p> <p>25 was incorrect.</p>	<p>Page 61</p> <p>1 D. Sauter</p> <p>2 Q. Okay. Again, that's your own</p> <p>3 conclusion. Is that fair?</p> <p>4 A. That's correct.</p> <p>5 Q. And then you continue on and you</p> <p>6 write: "Third" -- withdrawn.</p> <p>7 You write: "Third, it therefore</p> <p>8 appears that Mr. Waterhouse prepared the notes</p> <p>9 for some internal accounting or other purpose</p> <p>10 but without there being actual consideration</p> <p>11 for the notes and without any intention on the</p> <p>12 part of the debtor and HCMFA that there be</p> <p>13 notes or that there be a loan transaction."</p> <p>14 Have I read that correctly?</p> <p>15 A. Yes.</p> <p>16 Q. So did Mr. Waterhouse tell you that</p> <p>17 he prepared the notes for some internal</p> <p>18 accounting or other purpose?</p> <p>19 A. Yes.</p> <p>20 Q. And did he tell you what the purpose</p> <p>21 of the notes was?</p> <p>22 A. Yes.</p> <p>23 He said if he transferred money he</p> <p>24 had to have a note to go with it.</p> <p>25 Q. You state in your declaration:</p>

<p>Page 62</p> <p>1 D. Sauter</p> <p>2 "There was no" -- withdrawn.</p> <p>3 You state in your declaration that</p> <p>4 there was no "intention on the part of the</p> <p>5 debtor and HCMFA that there be notes or that</p> <p>6 there be a loan transaction."</p> <p>7 Do you see that?</p> <p>8 A. Yes.</p> <p>9 Q. What's the basis for --</p> <p>10 MR. RUKAVINA: Object to the form.</p> <p>11 I apologize. I apologize, John.</p> <p>12 I apologize, DC.</p> <p>13 I'll just object to the form.</p> <p>14 That's not what this says.</p> <p>15 Go ahead.</p> <p>16 MR. MORRIS: Well, then let me</p> <p>17 restate it if I read it incorrectly.</p> <p>18 BY MR. MORRIS:</p> <p>19 Q. Mr. Sauter, does the last sentence</p> <p>20 of your Paragraph 30 state, among other things,</p> <p>21 that the notes were prepared "without any</p> <p>22 intention on the part of the debtor and HCMFA</p> <p>23 that there be notes or that there be a loan</p> <p>24 transaction"?</p> <p>25 A. Yes.</p>	<p>Page 63</p> <p>1 D. Sauter</p> <p>2 Q. What's the basis for your sworn</p> <p>3 statement concerning the debtor's intentions?</p> <p>4 MR. RUKAVINA: Again, I'll object.</p> <p>5 Just so that we're clear, Mr. Sauter</p> <p>6 says "it appears that." He does not say it is</p> <p>7 a fact. He says "it appears that." There is a</p> <p>8 distinction there.</p> <p>9 MR. MORRIS: Okay. You've got your</p> <p>10 objection.</p> <p>11 BY MR. MORRIS:</p> <p>12 Q. What's the basis for your statement</p> <p>13 that it appeared the debtor had no intention</p> <p>14 that there would be notes or that there would</p> <p>15 be a loan transaction?</p> <p>16 A. If you're talking about a</p> <p>17 \$7.4 million obligation, I would assume that</p> <p>18 there would be a process internally on who was</p> <p>19 responsible for the payment of the fees for</p> <p>20 the -- or the expenses for the NAV error.</p> <p>21 Based upon my discussions with Frank</p> <p>22 Waterhouse, there was no process or the legal</p> <p>23 department was not involved in making a</p> <p>24 determination as to whether there should be</p> <p>25 notes. It was merely a ministerial act that</p>
<p>Page 64</p> <p>1 D. Sauter</p> <p>2 accounting performed when they transferred the</p> <p>3 funds to pay GAF.</p> <p>4 Q. Is it your testimony as the general</p> <p>5 counsel of Nexpoint that the law department or</p> <p>6 the legal department is involved in every note</p> <p>7 that's executed by one of the Highland</p> <p>8 affiliates?</p> <p>9 MR. RUKAVINA: Object to the form.</p> <p>10 THE WITNESS: I can't answer that.</p> <p>11 Q. Okay. So other than the fact that</p> <p>12 it didn't go past the legal department, do you</p> <p>13 have any other basis for your statement that it</p> <p>14 appears that the debtor had no intention that</p> <p>15 there would be notes?</p> <p>16 A. Yes, there's an internal NAV error</p> <p>17 correction policy that obligates the</p> <p>18 responsible party to pay for it.</p> <p>19 In this case it was HCMLP that made</p> <p>20 the NAV error.</p> <p>21 Q. There's a policy that you're</p> <p>22 referring to?</p> <p>23 A. Yes.</p> <p>24 Q. And do you know when that policy was</p> <p>25 adopted?</p>	<p>Page 65</p> <p>1 D. Sauter</p> <p>2 A. I don't know for certain.</p> <p>3 But I know there was a policy in</p> <p>4 place as of 2018.</p> <p>5 Q. Okay. Other than the policy, have</p> <p>6 you ever seen any memo written -- withdrawn.</p> <p>7 Have you ever seen any document in</p> <p>8 the world that states that HCMLP is responsible</p> <p>9 for the TerreStar NAV error?</p> <p>10 A. I would say the memos that</p> <p>11 acknowledged that there was a mistake.</p> <p>12 Q. And is it your recollection that the</p> <p>13 memos specifically say that HCMLP was</p> <p>14 responsible for the mistake?</p> <p>15 A. No, because the memos were vis-à-vis</p> <p>16 HCMFA and GAF.</p> <p>17 Q. Okay. So let me ask you the</p> <p>18 question again.</p> <p>19 During the course of your two</p> <p>20 investigations, did you ever see a document</p> <p>21 that stated that HCMLP was responsible for the</p> <p>22 TerreStar NAV error?</p> <p>23 A. I don't recall.</p> <p>24 Q. You don't recall seeing one. Is</p> <p>25 that correct?</p>

<p>Page 66</p> <p>1 D. Sauter</p> <p>2 A. That's correct.</p> <p>3 Q. Okay.</p> <p>4 A. Can we take a quick break?</p> <p>5 Q. Yeah, now would be perfectly fine.</p> <p>6 Give me just one second before we go</p> <p>7 off the record.</p> <p>8 So it's 2:15 local time. Can we</p> <p>9 limit it to ten minutes, Mr. Sauter?</p> <p>10 A. Yeah, that would be fine.</p> <p>11 Q. Okay. And I would ask that you're</p> <p>12 still under oath, and I would ask that you not</p> <p>13 speak with counsel or communicate with anybody</p> <p>14 about the substance of your deposition.</p> <p>15 Is that fair?</p> <p>16 MR. RUKAVINA: Don't answer that</p> <p>17 question, Mr. Sauter.</p> <p>18 The law is what it is, and we're not</p> <p>19 going to agree to something (audio issue) than</p> <p>20 the law requires.</p> <p>21 MR. MORRIS: Well, then I'm not</p> <p>22 going to take a break. How about that?</p> <p>23 Let's keep going.</p> <p>24 MR. RUKAVINA: No, we're taking a</p> <p>25 break and I'm going to the restroom.</p>	<p>Page 67</p> <p>1 D. Sauter</p> <p>2 MR. MORRIS: We're not taking a</p> <p>3 break, bud. I'm not --</p> <p>4 (Simultaneous crosstalk.)</p> <p>5 MR. RUKAVINA: We'll be back in ten</p> <p>6 minutes.</p> <p>7 MR. MORRIS: Hey, Davor, I'm going</p> <p>8 to ask your client a question. Okay?</p> <p>9 (Simultaneous crosstalk.)</p> <p>10 MR. RUKAVINA: -- but we're not --</p> <p>11 I'm sorry.</p> <p>12 You can ask him afterwards who he's</p> <p>13 talked to and about what, but you don't get to</p> <p>14 tell him that he can't talk to anyone.</p> <p>15 So let's go take a piss break and be</p> <p>16 back in nine minutes.</p> <p>17 MR. MORRIS: Put that on the record.</p> <p>18 (Recess was taken from 2:17 p.m. to</p> <p>19 2:28 p.m.)</p> <p>20 BY MR. MORRIS:</p> <p>21 Q. Are you ready to proceed, Mr.</p> <p>22 Sauter?</p> <p>23 A. I am.</p> <p>24 Q. During the break did you speak to</p> <p>25 anybody about the substance of your testimony?</p>
<p>Page 68</p> <p>1 D. Sauter</p> <p>2 A. I did not.</p> <p>3 Q. Okay. Did you communicate with</p> <p>4 anybody about the substance of your testimony?</p> <p>5 A. I did not.</p> <p>6 Q. I want to stick with the focus on</p> <p>7 the debtor's intent as stated in Paragraph 30.</p> <p>8 Before you prepared your</p> <p>9 declaration, did you spend any time reviewing</p> <p>10 any of the debtor's bankruptcy filings?</p> <p>11 A. Yes.</p> <p>12 Q. And are you aware that throughout</p> <p>13 the bankruptcy the debtor disclosed these notes</p> <p>14 as assets of the estate?</p> <p>15 A. Yes.</p> <p>16 Q. And what documents did you review</p> <p>17 that led you to conclude that the debtor was</p> <p>18 disclosing the notes as assets of the estate?</p> <p>19 Do you recall?</p> <p>20 A. I mean, I would have known it from</p> <p>21 the schedules. I would have known it from your</p> <p>22 complaint.</p> <p>23 Q. Okay. So you reviewed the debtor's</p> <p>24 schedules of assets and liabilities prior to</p> <p>25 the time you signed your declaration. Is that</p>	<p>Page 69</p> <p>1 D. Sauter</p> <p>2 right?</p> <p>3 A. Well, I didn't review them in</p> <p>4 connection with my preparation of the</p> <p>5 declaration, but yes, I had reviewed them.</p> <p>6 Q. And in reviewing them, did you learn</p> <p>7 that the debtor had in fact carried the notes</p> <p>8 as assets on its balance sheet or on its</p> <p>9 schedules of assets and liabilities?</p> <p>10 MR. RUKAVINA: I'm going to object</p> <p>11 to the form.</p> <p>12 THE WITNESS: I was aware that the</p> <p>13 debtor sought to collect on the note from</p> <p>14 HCMFA, the notes.</p> <p>15 BY MR. MORRIS:</p> <p>16 Q. Are you aware that Mr. Dondero was</p> <p>17 in control of Highland Capital Management, LP</p> <p>18 from at least the date of the bankruptcy filing</p> <p>19 in October 2019 through around January 9th,</p> <p>20 2020?</p> <p>21 A. Yes.</p> <p>22 Q. Okay. Are you aware that, while</p> <p>23 Mr. Dondero was in control of the debtor during</p> <p>24 that period, that Highland filed statements of</p> <p>25 financial affairs and schedules of assets?</p>

<p>Page 70</p> <p>1 D. Sauter</p> <p>2 A. Generally, I guess, yes.</p> <p>3 But I'm not aware of a particular</p> <p>4 document called statement of financial affairs.</p> <p>5 Q. Are you aware that while Mr. Dondero</p> <p>6 was in control of Highland during the</p> <p>7 bankruptcy, the debtor filed documents stating</p> <p>8 that the notes were assets of the estate?</p> <p>9 A. I was not.</p> <p>10 Q. Okay. Did you ever, as part of your</p> <p>11 investigation, try to see how the debtor</p> <p>12 treated the notes in its court filings?</p> <p>13 A. I did not, beyond the filing of the</p> <p>14 complaint.</p> <p>15 Q. So you never had a conversation with</p> <p>16 anybody -- withdrawn.</p> <p>17 Did you ever ask Mr. Waterhouse how</p> <p>18 the debtor treated the notes in its books and</p> <p>19 records?</p> <p>20 A. No.</p> <p>21 Q. Did you ever ask Mr. Waterhouse how</p> <p>22 HCMFA treated the notes in its books and</p> <p>23 records?</p> <p>24 A. No.</p> <p>25 Q. Have you been following developments</p>	<p>Page 71</p> <p>1 D. Sauter</p> <p>2 in this particular adversary proceeding?</p> <p>3 A. Yes.</p> <p>4 Q. Are you aware that both HCMFA and</p> <p>5 Highland disclosed the existence of the notes</p> <p>6 to their outside auditors within 30 days of</p> <p>7 their execution?</p> <p>8 MR. RUKAVINA: Objection, form.</p> <p>9 THE WITNESS: Yes.</p> <p>10 And it's my understanding that's why</p> <p>11 the notes were prepared.</p> <p>12 Q. And what's that understanding based</p> <p>13 on?</p> <p>14 MR. RUKAVINA: And now, Mr. Sauter,</p> <p>15 let's be very careful here.</p> <p>16 Please answer only if it's based on</p> <p>17 factual information that a nonlawyer told you.</p> <p>18 THE WITNESS: Yeah. I believe</p> <p>19 Mr. Waterhouse told me that he needed a note to</p> <p>20 document the transfer of funds.</p> <p>21 BY MR. MORRIS:</p> <p>22 Q. Okay. But I asked you a different</p> <p>23 question, and that's simply whether or not</p> <p>24 you're aware as you sit here today whether</p> <p>25 HCMFA and Highland disclosed the existence of</p>
<p>Page 72</p> <p>1 D. Sauter</p> <p>2 the notes to the outside auditors.</p> <p>3 MR. RUKAVINA: I'll object again.</p> <p>4 THE WITNESS: Yes, I am aware.</p> <p>5 Q. Have you ever seen HCMFA's audited</p> <p>6 financial statements?</p> <p>7 A. I don't recall.</p> <p>8 I think you asked me that earlier.</p> <p>9 And I may have seen them, but I don't recall</p> <p>10 specifically.</p> <p>11 Q. Do you recall looking at the audited</p> <p>12 financial statements as part of your</p> <p>13 investigation?</p> <p>14 A. No.</p> <p>15 Q. Let's put up HCMFA's audited</p> <p>16 financial statements for the period ending</p> <p>17 December 31st, 2018. And it's previously been</p> <p>18 marked as Deposition Exhibit 45.</p> <p>19 (Exhibit 45, Consolidated Financial</p> <p>20 Statements and Supplemental Information</p> <p>21 December 31, 2018, D-CNL002273-296, previously</p> <p>22 marked for identification.)</p> <p>23 Q. Do you see the first page there?</p> <p>24 This is the HCMFA consolidated</p> <p>25 financial statements for the period ending</p>	<p>Page 73</p> <p>1 D. Sauter</p> <p>2 December 31st, 2018.</p> <p>3 Do you see that?</p> <p>4 A. I do.</p> <p>5 Q. And I think you said you may have</p> <p>6 seen it before.</p> <p>7 Did I get that wrong?</p> <p>8 A. I said I may have.</p> <p>9 In looking at this, I don't think</p> <p>10 I've ever seen this document.</p> <p>11 Q. Okay. Can we just go to the third</p> <p>12 page and see the date.</p> <p>13 Do you see that this is the report</p> <p>14 of the independent auditors</p> <p>15 PricewaterhouseCoopers?</p> <p>16 A. Yes.</p> <p>17 Q. And you do see it's dated June 3rd,</p> <p>18 2019?</p> <p>19 A. Yes.</p> <p>20 Q. And do you understand that this</p> <p>21 document was prepared by HCMFA's outside</p> <p>22 auditors prior to Highland's bankruptcy filing?</p> <p>23 A. That's what it purports to be.</p> <p>24 Q. Okay. And it also purports to have</p> <p>25 been prepared prior to the commencement of the</p>

<p>Page 74</p> <p>1 D. Sauter</p> <p>2 adversary proceeding as you understand the</p> <p>3 timing. Correct?</p> <p>4 A. Yep.</p> <p>5 Q. Let's go to Page 17, please.</p> <p>6 Do you see there's a section in the</p> <p>7 audited financial statements called Subsequent</p> <p>8 Events?</p> <p>9 A. Yep.</p> <p>10 Q. Do you have any understanding as to</p> <p>11 what a Subsequent Events section is in audited</p> <p>12 financial statements?</p> <p>13 A. Yes.</p> <p>14 Q. What's your understanding of what</p> <p>15 that section is supposed to include?</p> <p>16 A. It's intended to pick up events that</p> <p>17 occurred after the date of the financials but</p> <p>18 prior to the date the financials are</p> <p>19 executed -- or issued.</p> <p>20 Q. And do you see in the second</p> <p>21 paragraph there's a description of the two</p> <p>22 notes?</p> <p>23 A. Yes.</p> <p>24 Q. Okay. You were not aware that the</p> <p>25 two notes were included in HCMFA's audited</p>	<p>Page 75</p> <p>1 D. Sauter</p> <p>2 financial statements for -- as subsequent</p> <p>3 events at the time you executed your</p> <p>4 declaration. Correct?</p> <p>5 A. Correct.</p> <p>6 Q. Now that you know that, do you think</p> <p>7 HCMFA made a mistake in including these notes</p> <p>8 in the audited financial statements, or does it</p> <p>9 cause you to reconsider your conclusion that</p> <p>10 the issuance of the notes was a mistake?</p> <p>11 MR. RUKAVINA: I'll object to that</p> <p>12 question based on form.</p> <p>13 THE WITNESS: You're asking me for</p> <p>14 my legal conclusion?</p> <p>15 Q. No, I'm not actually, but it</p> <p>16 probably wasn't a great question.</p> <p>17 So your conclusion was that the</p> <p>18 execution of the notes was a mistake. Correct?</p> <p>19 A. Yes.</p> <p>20 Q. But HCMFA is reporting the notes as</p> <p>21 part of its audited financial statements.</p> <p>22 Correct?</p> <p>23 A. Yes.</p> <p>24 Q. And do you understand that these</p> <p>25 financial statements have been audited by</p>
<p>Page 76</p> <p>1 D. Sauter</p> <p>2 independent -- an independent outside firm</p> <p>3 called PricewaterhouseCoopers?</p> <p>4 A. I assume they're audited financials.</p> <p>5 And yes, what you've shown me, it</p> <p>6 appears as though they were prepared by</p> <p>7 PricewaterhouseCoopers.</p> <p>8 Q. Okay. Would you agree with me that</p> <p>9 it's inconsistent that the notes can't be both</p> <p>10 a mistake and be reported as valid obligations</p> <p>11 in the audited financial statements?</p> <p>12 MR. RUKAVINA: I'll object.</p> <p>13 This witness is not an expert. He</p> <p>14 has no personal knowledge. This is well</p> <p>15 outside the scope of his factual investigation</p> <p>16 in May of 2021.</p> <p>17 BY MR. MORRIS:</p> <p>18 Q. You can answer, sir.</p> <p>19 A. I would agree that the two</p> <p>20 statements are at odds with one another.</p> <p>21 Q. Okay. So I'm just asking you</p> <p>22 whether -- now that you know that HCMFA</p> <p>23 included these in the audited financial</p> <p>24 statements, does that cause you to question at</p> <p>25 all your conclusion that the execution of the</p>	<p>Page 77</p> <p>1 D. Sauter</p> <p>2 notes was a mistake?</p> <p>3 MR. RUKAVINA: I'll again object.</p> <p>4 This witness is not an expert. He's</p> <p>5 not going to be a trial expert. And a motion</p> <p>6 to amend has already been agreed upon and ruled</p> <p>7 upon.</p> <p>8 BY MR. MORRIS:</p> <p>9 Q. You can answer, sir.</p> <p>10 A. I would say that the audited</p> <p>11 financials were prepared by</p> <p>12 PricewaterhouseCoopers with input from the</p> <p>13 accounting team.</p> <p>14 And as I stated previously, I think</p> <p>15 there was an -- a breakdown in the process that</p> <p>16 should have occurred, and had others looked at</p> <p>17 this, they wouldn't have come to the same</p> <p>18 conclusion.</p> <p>19 Q. So do you believe, based on the</p> <p>20 investigation that you did, that a second</p> <p>21 mistake occurred not only in signing the notes</p> <p>22 but including them in the audited financial</p> <p>23 statements?</p> <p>24 MR. RUKAVINA: Again, I'll object.</p> <p>25 This witness is not an expert. He</p>

<p>Page 78</p> <p>1 D. Sauter</p> <p>2 has no personal knowledge.</p> <p>3 THE WITNESS: Yeah, I can't tell you</p> <p>4 whether that's a mistake.</p> <p>5 My experience is that generally</p> <p>6 accounting folks internally said that.</p> <p>7 So if the accounting folks made a</p> <p>8 determination that the notes should be included</p> <p>9 as a subsequent event, then the auditors would</p> <p>10 include it as a subsequent event.</p> <p>11 BY MR. MORRIS:</p> <p>12 Q. Okay. Do you know, is there anybody</p> <p>13 at HCMFA who's responsible for overseeing the</p> <p>14 preparation of the audited financial</p> <p>15 statements?</p> <p>16 A. I think Mr. Waterhouse.</p> <p>17 Q. When did you first learn that the</p> <p>18 notes had been included in the financial</p> <p>19 statements?</p> <p>20 Are you learning that for the first</p> <p>21 time right now or did you know that before</p> <p>22 today?</p> <p>23 A. I think I heard that a couple weeks</p> <p>24 ago.</p> <p>25 MR. RUKAVINA: Let's be careful here</p>	<p>Page 79</p> <p>1 D. Sauter</p> <p>2 again, Mr. Sauter, to exclude our</p> <p>3 communications, please.</p> <p>4 THE WITNESS: Okay.</p> <p>5 Q. Do you know if HCMFA ever reached</p> <p>6 out to PricewaterhouseCoopers to inform them</p> <p>7 that their audited financial statements were</p> <p>8 incorrect?</p> <p>9 A. I don't know.</p> <p>10 Q. Do you know whether the debtor</p> <p>11 included reference to the notes in its audited</p> <p>12 financial statements?</p> <p>13 A. I don't.</p> <p>14 Q. Let's go back to your declaration,</p> <p>15 please, Paragraph 28.</p> <p>16 Okay. So Paragraph 28 says: "The</p> <p>17 debtor accepted responsibility to HCMFA for</p> <p>18 having caused the NAV error, and the debtor</p> <p>19 ultimately, whether through insurance or its</p> <p>20 own funds, compensated HCMFA for the above</p> <p>21 payments."</p> <p>22 Have I read that correctly?</p> <p>23 A. Correct.</p> <p>24 Q. Paragraph 28 doesn't cite any source</p> <p>25 for that statement. Right?</p>
<p>Page 80</p> <p>1 D. Sauter</p> <p>2 A. Correct.</p> <p>3 Q. Okay. You don't attribute that</p> <p>4 statement to any particular person. Correct?</p> <p>5 A. That's correct.</p> <p>6 Q. What is the basis for your statement</p> <p>7 that the debtor accepted responsibility to</p> <p>8 HCMFA?</p> <p>9 A. It would be that the debtor's</p> <p>10 employees who performed the valuation function</p> <p>11 acknowledged that they had made a mistake.</p> <p>12 Q. And who are those employees?</p> <p>13 A. Well, ultimately I don't know</p> <p>14 exactly who it was that came to that</p> <p>15 determination, but I think it was Frank</p> <p>16 Waterhouse and Thomas Surgent.</p> <p>17 Q. Did you ever interview Mr. Surgent</p> <p>18 as part of your investigation?</p> <p>19 A. No, I was prohibited from speaking</p> <p>20 with him.</p> <p>21 Q. So you're not aware of</p> <p>22 Mr. Waterhouse ever saying that the debtor</p> <p>23 accepted responsibility -- withdrawn.</p> <p>24 You're not aware of Mr. Surgent --</p> <p>25 withdrawn.</p>	<p>Page 81</p> <p>1 D. Sauter</p> <p>2 You have no personal knowledge that</p> <p>3 Mr. Surgent accepted, on behalf of the debtor,</p> <p>4 responsibility for the NAV error. Correct?</p> <p>5 A. I have no personal knowledge of</p> <p>6 that, correct.</p> <p>7 Q. Okay. And did Mr. Waterhouse tell</p> <p>8 you that the debtor accepted responsibility to</p> <p>9 HCMFA for having caused the NAV error?</p> <p>10 A. I think Mr. Waterhouse said that the</p> <p>11 HCMFA employees who formed the valuation</p> <p>12 committee ultimately concluded that they had</p> <p>13 made a mistake and they needed to accept that.</p> <p>14 Q. Okay. It doesn't say that in your</p> <p>15 declaration, does it?</p> <p>16 A. Doesn't say what?</p> <p>17 Q. That Mr. Waterhouse told you that.</p> <p>18 A. No.</p> <p>19 Q. In fact, is there any particular</p> <p>20 reason why you didn't share that with the</p> <p>21 court?</p> <p>22 A. No.</p> <p>23 Q. Is there anything in writing that</p> <p>24 you've ever seen which states that the debtor</p> <p>25 accepts responsibility to HCMFA for having</p>

<p>Page 82</p> <p>1 D. Sauter</p> <p>2 caused the NAV error?</p> <p>3 A. Other than what I've identified, no.</p> <p>4 Q. And what you've identified is that</p> <p>5 policy. Is that right?</p> <p>6 A. There's a policy and the</p> <p>7 acknowledgment that the NAV error was made by</p> <p>8 the HCMLP employees who were on the valuation</p> <p>9 committee.</p> <p>10 Q. Okay. You're aware that shortly</p> <p>11 after HCMFA paid the \$7.4 million to the fund,</p> <p>12 HCMFA sent the fund a written report. Is that</p> <p>13 right?</p> <p>14 A. Yes.</p> <p>15 Q. Let's take a look at that, if we can</p> <p>16 put that on the screen.</p> <p>17 MS. CANTY: Sorry, John, you went</p> <p>18 out for a second.</p> <p>19 Can you say that again.</p> <p>20 MR. MORRIS: Yeah.</p> <p>21 If you could, I think -- I think I</p> <p>22 had it listed as Exhibit 37, but it's one of</p> <p>23 the new ones. It's the memo, I think, from</p> <p>24 HCMFA to the funds.</p> <p>25 MS. CANTY: Got it.</p>	<p>Page 83</p> <p>1 D. Sauter</p> <p>2 (Exhibit 182, Memo dated 5/28/19,</p> <p>3 previously marked for identification.)</p> <p>4 BY MR. MORRIS:</p> <p>5 Q. Is this one of the memos that -- and</p> <p>6 again, Mr. Sauter, if you need to see more of</p> <p>7 it, just let me know.</p> <p>8 But is this one of the memos that</p> <p>9 you saw as part of your investigation?</p> <p>10 A. I believe so.</p> <p>11 Q. Okay. And do you understand that</p> <p>12 this is a memo from HCMFA to the board of the</p> <p>13 Highland Global Allocation Fund?</p> <p>14 A. Yes.</p> <p>15 Q. And this is where HCMFA describes</p> <p>16 for the board the resolution of the NAV error.</p> <p>17 Correct?</p> <p>18 A. Correct.</p> <p>19 Q. Okay. And did you discuss this memo</p> <p>20 with anybody as part of your investigation?</p> <p>21 A. I mean, other than reviewing it, no.</p> <p>22 Q. So -- and how did you obtain a copy</p> <p>23 of it?</p> <p>24 A. Mr. Post.</p> <p>25 Q. So Mr. Post gave it to you.</p>
<p>Page 84</p> <p>1 D. Sauter</p> <p>2 But you didn't speak with him about</p> <p>3 it in substance. Correct?</p> <p>4 A. I mean, I spoke to him about the</p> <p>5 transaction and the mistake.</p> <p>6 I did the same thing with Dustin</p> <p>7 Norris.</p> <p>8 Q. Okay. But you didn't speak with</p> <p>9 anybody about the substance of this memo.</p> <p>10 Correct?</p> <p>11 A. Correct.</p> <p>12 Q. Okay. And -- but you did see this</p> <p>13 memo before you signed your declaration.</p> <p>14 Correct?</p> <p>15 A. Yes.</p> <p>16 Q. Okay. And do you have an</p> <p>17 understanding of what this memo is?</p> <p>18 A. Yeah.</p> <p>19 I'd like to take a -- I'd like to</p> <p>20 see the memo in full.</p> <p>21 Q. Sure. Take your time.</p> <p>22 So just tell Ms. Canty when you want</p> <p>23 to see more and then she'll scroll.</p> <p>24 Okay. Stop right there.</p> <p>25 A. (Reviewing document.)</p>	<p>Page 85</p> <p>1 D. Sauter</p> <p>2 Yes. Okay.</p> <p>3 Q. So then the second page is this NAV</p> <p>4 error breakdown.</p> <p>5 Do you see that?</p> <p>6 A. Yes.</p> <p>7 Q. All right. We'll come to that, but</p> <p>8 let's go back to the first page.</p> <p>9 Have you taken a look at the second</p> <p>10 paragraph there that begins: "The advisor and</p> <p>11 Houlihan Lokey, an independent third party</p> <p>12 expert valuation consultant approved by the</p> <p>13 board," have you read that paragraph?</p> <p>14 A. Yes.</p> <p>15 Q. Okay. To the best of your</p> <p>16 knowledge, did HCMFA accurately define "NAV</p> <p>17 error" for the board in that paragraph?</p> <p>18 MR. RUKAVINA: Objection --</p> <p>19 THE WITNESS: As far as I know, yes.</p> <p>20 MR. RUKAVINA: This witness is not</p> <p>21 an expert and has no personal knowledge.</p> <p>22 Q. Do you have any reason to believe</p> <p>23 that HCMFA did not accurately describe for the</p> <p>24 board the definition of "NAV error"?</p> <p>25 A. No.</p>

<p>Page 86</p> <p>1 D. Sauter</p> <p>2 Q. Do you have any reason to believe --</p> <p>3 take a look at the last sentence.</p> <p>4 "The orderly determination and</p> <p>5 adoption of the weighted fair valuation</p> <p>6 methodology resulted in NAV errors in the</p> <p>7 fund."</p> <p>8 Do you see that?</p> <p>9 A. Yes.</p> <p>10 Q. And that's what's being defined as</p> <p>11 the NAV error. Correct?</p> <p>12 A. Yes.</p> <p>13 Q. Do you have any reason to believe</p> <p>14 that that sentence is false or misleading in</p> <p>15 any way?</p> <p>16 A. I do not.</p> <p>17 Q. Nothing you uncovered during your</p> <p>18 investigation caused you to believe that that</p> <p>19 sentence was false or misleading in any way.</p> <p>20 Correct?</p> <p>21 A. No.</p> <p>22 Q. Okay. And the advisor was the</p> <p>23 entity that made the orderly determination.</p> <p>24 Correct?</p> <p>25 A. That's what this memo says.</p>	<p>Page 87</p> <p>1 D. Sauter</p> <p>2 Q. Okay. Who's Houlihan Lokey? Do you</p> <p>3 know who Houlihan Lokey is?</p> <p>4 A. It's a third party valuation firm.</p> <p>5 Q. Do they have a good reputation?</p> <p>6 A. Yes.</p> <p>7 Q. And did they do the valuation of</p> <p>8 TerreStar?</p> <p>9 A. That's my understanding.</p> <p>10 Q. Okay. And were they retained by the</p> <p>11 advisor or by HCMLP?</p> <p>12 A. I don't know.</p> <p>13 Q. Did you ever ask anybody who hired</p> <p>14 Houlihan Lokey?</p> <p>15 A. I did not.</p> <p>16 Q. Do you know whether HCMFA utilizes</p> <p>17 Houlihan Lokey's valuation services in the</p> <p>18 ordinary course of its business?</p> <p>19 A. I don't know.</p> <p>20 I know that Houlihan Lokey has been</p> <p>21 utilized by either HCMLP, HCMFA or Nexpoint</p> <p>22 Advisors in the past.</p> <p>23 Q. And to the best of your knowledge,</p> <p>24 has -- have those entities continued to use</p> <p>25 Houlihan Lokey even after May 2019?</p>
<p>Page 88</p> <p>1 D. Sauter</p> <p>2 A. I -- I don't know.</p> <p>3 Q. Do you know whether anybody ever</p> <p>4 suggested that Houlihan Lokey was responsible</p> <p>5 for the valuation error?</p> <p>6 A. I don't.</p> <p>7 Q. Did you ever ask anybody if Houlihan</p> <p>8 Lokey was responsible for the valuation error?</p> <p>9 A. No.</p> <p>10 Q. Do you know if -- to the best of</p> <p>11 your knowledge, this memo was given to the</p> <p>12 board by HCMFA. Correct?</p> <p>13 A. Yes.</p> <p>14 Q. Did -- having reviewed the memo, is</p> <p>15 there anything that you're aware of in this</p> <p>16 memo where HCMFA tells the board that HCMLP is</p> <p>17 responsible for the NAV error?</p> <p>18 A. No.</p> <p>19 And I don't think that they would.</p> <p>20 It would be irrelevant.</p> <p>21 MR. MORRIS: I move to strike the</p> <p>22 latter portion of the answer.</p> <p>23 Q. Let's take a look at the bottom</p> <p>24 paragraph there.</p> <p>25 Do you see that there's a reference</p>	<p>Page 89</p> <p>1 D. Sauter</p> <p>2 to two different payments?</p> <p>3 A. Yes.</p> <p>4 Q. A payment of approximately</p> <p>5 \$5.2 million was made on February 15th, 2019,</p> <p>6 and a second payment of approximately</p> <p>7 \$2.4 million was made on May 2nd.</p> <p>8 Do I have that right?</p> <p>9 A. Yes.</p> <p>10 Q. Do you know what the source of</p> <p>11 funding was for the first payment?</p> <p>12 A. I do not.</p> <p>13 Q. Did you ever ask anybody how</p> <p>14 HCMFA -- withdrawn.</p> <p>15 Did you ever ask anybody what the</p> <p>16 source of HCMFA's funding was to make the</p> <p>17 payment on February 15th, 2019?</p> <p>18 A. Say that again.</p> <p>19 Q. Did you ever ask anybody what the</p> <p>20 source of HCMFA's capital was to make that</p> <p>21 payment on February 15th?</p> <p>22 A. I was told that it was a transfer</p> <p>23 from HCMLP.</p> <p>24 Q. You were told that the transfer from</p> <p>25 HCMLP was made in February of 2019?</p>

<p>Page 90</p> <p>1 D. Sauter</p> <p>2 A. Yes.</p> <p>3 Q. Who told you that?</p> <p>4 A. Mr. Waterhouse.</p> <p>5 Q. Okay. Do you know what the source</p> <p>6 was -- hold on one second.</p> <p>7 And do you know what the source of</p> <p>8 the second payment was, that \$2.4 million on</p> <p>9 May 2nd, 2019?</p> <p>10 A. HCMLP.</p> <p>11 Q. Now, we saw earlier that one of the</p> <p>12 notes was for \$2.4 million on May 2nd.</p> <p>13 Do you recall that?</p> <p>14 A. Yes. Yes.</p> <p>15 Q. Okay. So is it fair -- did you</p> <p>16 conclude as part of your investigation that at</p> <p>17 least the amount and the date of the payment</p> <p>18 matched the amount and the date of the note?</p> <p>19 A. I did on the second note, yes.</p> <p>20 Q. Okay. But the -- neither the amount</p> <p>21 nor the date of the first payment matched the</p> <p>22 amount or the date of the second note.</p> <p>23 Correct?</p> <p>24 A. That's correct.</p> <p>25 Q. Let's take a look at the second</p>	<p>Page 91</p> <p>1 D. Sauter</p> <p>2 page.</p> <p>3 Have you seen this before?</p> <p>4 A. I have.</p> <p>5 Q. Did you ever have any discussions</p> <p>6 with anybody at any time during your</p> <p>7 investigation about this page?</p> <p>8 A. I did at some point, and I don't</p> <p>9 recall exactly when.</p> <p>10 Q. Okay.</p> <p>11 A. But probably it may have been after</p> <p>12 the declaration.</p> <p>13 Q. Okay. Do you understand that the</p> <p>14 first -- I think it's a row -- shows that the</p> <p>15 total estimated net loss resulting from the NAV</p> <p>16 error was approximately \$7.44 million?</p> <p>17 A. Yes, I see that.</p> <p>18 Q. Okay. And do you understand that</p> <p>19 this chart depicts the sources that are going</p> <p>20 to be called upon to fund the \$7.44 million</p> <p>21 payment from HCMFA to the fund?</p> <p>22 A. I -- yes, I understand that now.</p> <p>23 Q. And do you understand that</p> <p>24 approximately \$5 million was going to be funded</p> <p>25 through insurance proceeds?</p>
<p>Page 92</p> <p>1 D. Sauter</p> <p>2 A. That's what it appears to show.</p> <p>3 Q. And during your investigation, were</p> <p>4 you aware that HCMFA had obtained almost</p> <p>5 \$5 million in connection with the NAV error</p> <p>6 that it was using to fund the payment to GAF?</p> <p>7 A. I subsequently learned that, yes.</p> <p>8 Q. And were you aware prior to the time</p> <p>9 that you signed your declaration -- I apologize</p> <p>10 if I asked this before -- withdrawn.</p> <p>11 Were you aware of the almost</p> <p>12 \$5 million in insurance proceeds that was --</p> <p>13 that were obtained by HCMFA before you signed</p> <p>14 your declaration?</p> <p>15 A. I was not.</p> <p>16 Q. So that's new information for you</p> <p>17 since the time you signed your declaration?</p> <p>18 A. Yes.</p> <p>19 Q. Okay. Were you aware at the time</p> <p>20 you signed your declaration that HCMFA had paid</p> <p>21 an insurance deductible of almost \$250,000?</p> <p>22 A. I was not.</p> <p>23 Q. Is it your understanding that after</p> <p>24 the sources described in the top portion of</p> <p>25 this page, that the total amount needed by the</p>	<p>Page 93</p> <p>1 D. Sauter</p> <p>2 advisor to make GAF whole was approximately</p> <p>3 \$2.4 million?</p> <p>4 That's the 2,398,842 number there.</p> <p>5 A. I've not done the math.</p> <p>6 Q. Well, that number there matches the</p> <p>7 number in the bottom paragraph of the first</p> <p>8 page, if we can scroll back up.</p> <p>9 A. Yeah. No, I understand.</p> <p>10 Q. Okay. So that's the total payment</p> <p>11 that was made on May 2nd, 2019, according to</p> <p>12 this memo?</p> <p>13 A. That's total payment made to GAF.</p> <p>14 What I'm unclear about is that it's</p> <p>15 the total amount out of pocket from the</p> <p>16 advisor, which may be different, but...</p> <p>17 Q. Do you know what the total out of</p> <p>18 pocket was from the advisor?</p> <p>19 A. I don't.</p> <p>20 (Simultaneous crosstalk.)</p> <p>21 THE WITNESS: -- what's listed here.</p> <p>22 Q. And do you understand that a total</p> <p>23 of \$7.44 million was paid by HCMFA to GAF?</p> <p>24 A. I do.</p> <p>25 Q. Okay. And do you have any reason to</p>

<p>Page 94</p> <p>1 D. Sauter</p> <p>2 believe that the source of the funding is</p> <p>3 anything other than what's set forth on this</p> <p>4 page?</p> <p>5 A. I don't.</p> <p>6 Q. And the \$2.4 million, that's the</p> <p>7 \$2.4 million that HCMFA obtained from Highland</p> <p>8 on May 2nd. Correct?</p> <p>9 MR. RUKAVINA: Objection.</p> <p>10 The witness is not qualified to</p> <p>11 answer that.</p> <p>12 Q. During the course of your</p> <p>13 investigation, did you learn that Highland</p> <p>14 transferred \$2.4 million to HCMFA on May 2nd,</p> <p>15 2019 so that it could pay GAF?</p> <p>16 A. That's what I was told.</p> <p>17 Q. Okay. Is it your conclusion that</p> <p>18 Highland was responsible for the \$7.44 million</p> <p>19 estimated net loss resulting from the NAV</p> <p>20 error?</p> <p>21 MR. RUKAVINA: Objection.</p> <p>22 This witness is not an expert, and</p> <p>23 he has no personal knowledge.</p> <p>24 THE WITNESS: Yes, I believe that</p> <p>25 that's accurate.</p>	<p>Page 95</p> <p>1 D. Sauter</p> <p>2 BY MR. MORRIS:</p> <p>3 Q. And that's because you believe the</p> <p>4 notes were executed by mistake. Correct?</p> <p>5 A. I believe that Highland made the NAV</p> <p>6 error and was responsible for making GAF whole,</p> <p>7 albeit vis-à-vis HCMFA, its advisor.</p> <p>8 Q. Okay. So because Highland created</p> <p>9 the NAV error, your understanding based on your</p> <p>10 discussions with Mr. Post and Mr. Norris is</p> <p>11 that Highland paid the \$7.4 million to HCMFA</p> <p>12 not as a loan but as compensation for the error</p> <p>13 that it made.</p> <p>14 Do I have that right?</p> <p>15 A. That would not be based on my</p> <p>16 discussions with Mr. Post and Mr. Norris.</p> <p>17 But yes, your conclusion is</p> <p>18 accurate.</p> <p>19 Q. Okay. And let's be really clear</p> <p>20 what the conclusion is.</p> <p>21 It's your conclusion that because</p> <p>22 Highland was negligent in making the NAV error,</p> <p>23 that when it paid \$7.4 million to HCMFA on</p> <p>24 May 2nd and May 3rd, 2019, it did so as</p> <p>25 compensation for its negligent conduct and not</p>
<p>Page 96</p> <p>1 D. Sauter</p> <p>2 as a loan. Correct?</p> <p>3 A. I didn't say negligent, and I don't</p> <p>4 know that I can make that conclusion.</p> <p>5 But it should have been indemnity</p> <p>6 and reimbursement for the error that Highland</p> <p>7 created.</p> <p>8 Q. Okay. Can you tell me why HCMFA</p> <p>9 took \$5 million from an insurance company at</p> <p>10 the same time it was being made whole by</p> <p>11 Highland?</p> <p>12 MR. RUKAVINA: I'll instruct you not</p> <p>13 to answer that.</p> <p>14 That is attorney client privileged</p> <p>15 and work product.</p> <p>16 Q. Sir, as part of your investigation,</p> <p>17 did you make any assessment as to why HCMFA</p> <p>18 accepted \$5 million in proceed -- in insurance</p> <p>19 proceeds at the same time it believed that the</p> <p>20 \$7.4 million was being paid by Highland as</p> <p>21 compensation?</p> <p>22 MR. RUKAVINA: Just want to make</p> <p>23 sure, Mr. Sauter, you understand that counsel</p> <p>24 is asking about your investigation in May of</p> <p>25 this year as referenced in your declaration and</p>	<p>Page 97</p> <p>1 D. Sauter</p> <p>2 not the investigation generally.</p> <p>3 THE WITNESS: Yes.</p> <p>4 And as I said, the May declaration,</p> <p>5 I was unaware of the \$5 million in insurance</p> <p>6 payments.</p> <p>7 BY MR. MORRIS:</p> <p>8 Q. Now that you're aware of it, does it</p> <p>9 cause you to question your conclusion that the</p> <p>10 payment made by Highland in May of 2019 was</p> <p>11 compensation and not a loan?</p> <p>12 MR. RUKAVINA: I instruct you not to</p> <p>13 answer that, Mr. Sauter.</p> <p>14 MR. MORRIS: On what basis? That</p> <p>15 you don't like the question?</p> <p>16 MR. RUKAVINA: No.</p> <p>17 Let's be professional here, John. I</p> <p>18 don't know why you've got to get --</p> <p>19 (Simultaneous crosstalk.)</p> <p>20 MR. MORRIS: I don't understand.</p> <p>21 It's a --</p> <p>22 MR. RUKAVINA: No, you -- the way --</p> <p>23 MR. MORRIS: It's an investigation.</p> <p>24 He made a conclusion in the investigation.</p> <p>25 He's now learned a new fact. I'm</p>

<p>Page 98</p> <p>1 D. Sauter</p> <p>2 allowed to ask him if it changes his</p> <p>3 conclusion.</p> <p>4 MR. RUKAVINA: Let me just explain</p> <p>5 what I understand, what's going on here.</p> <p>6 He undertook an evidentiary and</p> <p>7 factual conclusion, which is fair game for you</p> <p>8 to ask about. Pardon me.</p> <p>9 He's told you that he didn't know</p> <p>10 about this. His declaration says -- I'm</p> <p>11 paraphrasing -- it appears that there was a</p> <p>12 mistake.</p> <p>13 He has never claimed to have</p> <p>14 personal knowledge. He has never claimed to be</p> <p>15 an expert. He is not going to be a trial</p> <p>16 witness. He has never testified and is not</p> <p>17 testifying today that there was a mistake.</p> <p>18 But most importantly, and why I'm</p> <p>19 instructing him not to answer, is because the</p> <p>20 issue of how this payment relates to the</p> <p>21 insurance payable, which again arose after his</p> <p>22 declaration and is something that he and I have</p> <p>23 discussed and is my work product. That is not</p> <p>24 a part of his factual investigation.</p> <p>25 So I am instructing him not to</p>	<p>Page 99</p> <p>1 D. Sauter</p> <p>2 answer. There's no point in you and I arguing</p> <p>3 about it now.</p> <p>4 If you feel my objection is</p> <p>5 inappropriate, then you have your rights</p> <p>6 intact.</p> <p>7 MR. MORRIS: All right. I'm going</p> <p>8 to continue to ask questions.</p> <p>9 BY MR. MORRIS:</p> <p>10 Q. Sir, you had this document before</p> <p>11 you signed your declaration. Correct?</p> <p>12 A. I did.</p> <p>13 Q. Okay. And your conclusion was that</p> <p>14 because Highland made the NAV mistake, the</p> <p>15 \$7.4 million payment was supposed to be</p> <p>16 compensation and not in the form of a loan.</p> <p>17 Correct?</p> <p>18 MR. RUKAVINA: Objection, form.</p> <p>19 THE WITNESS: Correct.</p> <p>20 Q. Okay. And now the document that you</p> <p>21 had before you signed your declaration</p> <p>22 discloses that HCMFA received almost \$5 million</p> <p>23 as part of the insurance proceeds in connection</p> <p>24 with the NAV error. Correct?</p> <p>25 A. Yes.</p>
<p>Page 100</p> <p>1 D. Sauter</p> <p>2 Q. Okay. Does that cause you to change</p> <p>3 the conclusion that you reached as set forth in</p> <p>4 your declaration?</p> <p>5 A. I don't know enough about the</p> <p>6 insurance proceeds, the insurance policy and</p> <p>7 what transpired at the time to make that</p> <p>8 determination.</p> <p>9 Q. Do you know if HCMFA has ever</p> <p>10 informed the insurance carrier that HCMLP was</p> <p>11 responsible for the NAV error?</p> <p>12 A. I do not.</p> <p>13 Q. Did you ever ask anybody?</p> <p>14 A. I did not.</p> <p>15 Q. As part of your investigation, did</p> <p>16 you try to determine whether HCMFA ever told</p> <p>17 the insurance company that HCMLP was</p> <p>18 responsible for the NAV error?</p> <p>19 A. I think I already said I wasn't</p> <p>20 aware of the insurance proceeds at the time of</p> <p>21 my declaration.</p> <p>22 Q. Has HCMFA returned all or any</p> <p>23 portion of the insurance proceeds to the</p> <p>24 carrier?</p> <p>25 A. I wouldn't know.</p>	<p>Page 101</p> <p>1 D. Sauter</p> <p>2 Q. Have you ever asked anybody?</p> <p>3 A. No.</p> <p>4 MR. RUKAVINA: You've got to wait a</p> <p>5 second, Mr. Sauter, before answering.</p> <p>6 Go ahead.</p> <p>7 Q. During the course of your</p> <p>8 investigation, did anybody tell you that on</p> <p>9 May 3rd, 2019, HCMFA needed another \$5 million?</p> <p>10 A. Not during the course of my initial</p> <p>11 investigation.</p> <p>12 Q. Are you aware of that today?</p> <p>13 A. I am, yes.</p> <p>14 Q. Okay. And do you understand that</p> <p>15 that \$5 million was needed in order for HCMFA</p> <p>16 to pay what's called a consent fee?</p> <p>17 MR. RUKAVINA: I'm going to object.</p> <p>18 And I'm going to instruct the</p> <p>19 witness not to answer.</p> <p>20 Again, this is attorney-client</p> <p>21 privilege and work product.</p> <p>22 He learned about all of this well</p> <p>23 after his investigation and well after his</p> <p>24 declaration.</p> <p>25 MR. MORRIS: These are facts.</p>

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 102</p> <p>1 D. Sauter</p> <p>2 I don't get it. These are facts.</p> <p>3 And I'm not limited to his declaration. He's</p> <p>4 here under a subpoena. I can ask him whatever</p> <p>5 I want factually.</p> <p>6 I don't understand, Davor.</p> <p>7 MR. RUKAVINA: Well, there's three</p> <p>8 things.</p> <p>9 You're generally right, you can ask</p> <p>10 him whatever you want factually. I'm not</p> <p>11 saying that he -- I haven't prevented you from</p> <p>12 asking factually. That's issue one.</p> <p>13 Issue two, he's not a trial witness.</p> <p>14 His role is limited to the motion to amend,</p> <p>15 which was granted by consent.</p> <p>16 And issue three, the question you're</p> <p>17 asking him right now, if he has any knowledge,</p> <p>18 he can have only through discussions with me</p> <p>19 and things he's learned through me in this</p> <p>20 litigation. He's told you he did not know</p> <p>21 about this during his investigation.</p> <p>22 So I'm going to stick by my</p> <p>23 instruction not to answer that, Mr. Sauter.</p> <p>24 MR. MORRIS: And I'm going to tell</p> <p>25 you he is a trial witness. I will certainly be</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 103</p> <p>1 D. Sauter</p> <p>2 calling him at trial because he conducted an</p> <p>3 investigation.</p> <p>4 And I don't think that I need to</p> <p>5 stop asking questions as of the date of his</p> <p>6 declaration. I'm asking purely factual</p> <p>7 questions.</p> <p>8 So you know, if you want to continue</p> <p>9 to direct him not to answer, we'll deal with</p> <p>10 it, but I'm going to continue to ask him</p> <p>11 factual questions.</p> <p>12 MR. RUKAVINA: To me, this is --</p> <p>13 (Simultaneous crosstalk.)</p> <p>14 BY MR. MORRIS:</p> <p>15 Q. Mr. Sauter, do you understand that</p> <p>16 the \$5 million was needed by HCMFA on May 3rd,</p> <p>17 2019 to pay a consent fee?</p> <p>18 MR. RUKAVINA: I'm going to instruct</p> <p>19 you not to answer that, Mr. Sauter.</p> <p>20 Q. Are you going to follow your</p> <p>21 counsel's instructions?</p> <p>22 A. I am.</p> <p>23 Q. Do you know what a consent fee is,</p> <p>24 sir?</p> <p>25 A. I don't.</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 104</p> <p>1 D. Sauter</p> <p>2 Q. Did you ever have -- withdrawn.</p> <p>3 Did anybody ever tell you that</p> <p>4 Highland was responsible for any consent fee</p> <p>5 that HCMFA paid?</p> <p>6 MR. RUKAVINA: You're instructed not</p> <p>7 to answer that to the extent that whoever told</p> <p>8 you that would be an attorney.</p> <p>9 BY MR. MORRIS:</p> <p>10 Q. Okay. Did anybody other than an</p> <p>11 attorney ever tell you that Highland was</p> <p>12 responsible for any consent fee ever paid by</p> <p>13 HCMFA?</p> <p>14 A. That Highland was responsible for</p> <p>15 paying a consent fee?</p> <p>16 Q. That Highland was responsible for</p> <p>17 any consent fee that was paid by HCMFA.</p> <p>18 A. I don't believe so.</p> <p>19 Q. During your discussions as part of</p> <p>20 your investigation with Mr. Norris and Mr. Post</p> <p>21 and Mr. Dondero and Mr. Waterhouse, did anybody</p> <p>22 tell you why Highland paid HCMFA \$5 million on</p> <p>23 May 3rd, 2019?</p> <p>24 A. Yes.</p> <p>25 Q. And why did -- what did they tell</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 105</p> <p>1 D. Sauter</p> <p>2 you?</p> <p>3 A. It was payment for a consent fee.</p> <p>4 Q. All right. Okay.</p> <p>5 And who told you that?</p> <p>6 A. Mr. Norris.</p> <p>7 Q. And did Mr. Norris tell you that</p> <p>8 Highland had any responsibility for the payment</p> <p>9 of that consent fee by HCMFA?</p> <p>10 A. I don't know that we got into that.</p> <p>11 Q. Okay. Did anybody else tell you</p> <p>12 that the May 3rd, 2019 \$5 million payment was</p> <p>13 made so that HCMFA could pay the consent fee?</p> <p>14 MR. RUKAVINA: Again, I'll instruct</p> <p>15 you not to answer the extent you learned</p> <p>16 anything from an attorney.</p> <p>17 THE WITNESS: I don't believe so.</p> <p>18 Q. Okay. Did you speak with</p> <p>19 Mr. Waterhouse about the \$5 million consent fee</p> <p>20 that Mr. Norris mentioned to you?</p> <p>21 A. I have not spoken with</p> <p>22 Mr. Waterhouse for quite some time about this,</p> <p>23 since he's represented by counsel.</p> <p>24 Q. No.</p> <p>25 But as part of your investigation,</p>

<p>Page 106</p> <p>1 D. Sauter</p> <p>2 after you learned from Mr. Norris that the</p> <p>3 \$5 million was paid so that HCMFA could pay the</p> <p>4 consent fee, did you follow up with</p> <p>5 Mr. Waterhouse at all?</p> <p>6 A. I didn't know about the consent fee</p> <p>7 at the time of my investigation.</p> <p>8 Q. Okay. When did Mr. Norris tell you</p> <p>9 about the consent fee?</p> <p>10 A. Probably within the last six weeks.</p> <p>11 Q. And does learning about the consent</p> <p>12 fee from Mr. Norris cause you to question your</p> <p>13 conclusion that the \$7.4 million was paid by</p> <p>14 Highland to HCMFA on account of the mistake</p> <p>15 that Highland made on the NAV error?</p> <p>16 MR. RUKAVINA: I'll again object</p> <p>17 that this witness is not an expert and he has</p> <p>18 no personal knowledge.</p> <p>19 Q. You can answer, sir.</p> <p>20 A. I wasn't aware of the consent fee.</p> <p>21 I don't know much about the consent</p> <p>22 fee. I don't know what it is, who paid it, why</p> <p>23 they paid it, what the consideration was for</p> <p>24 it.</p> <p>25 So I'm not prepared to answer that.</p>	<p>Page 107</p> <p>1 D. Sauter</p> <p>2 Q. Okay. Let's go back to your</p> <p>3 declaration, please, Paragraph 31.</p> <p>4 Is it fair to summarize this</p> <p>5 paragraph as saying that because HCMFA and the</p> <p>6 debtor had executed that acknowledgment, that</p> <p>7 it would have been illogical for Highland to</p> <p>8 lend HCMFA \$7.4 million in May 2021?</p> <p>9 A. Yes.</p> <p>10 Q. Okay. And what was the source of</p> <p>11 your information for Paragraph 31?</p> <p>12 A. I'm not sure I follow.</p> <p>13 Q. So you've got the acknowledgment</p> <p>14 that you attached as Exhibit 4. Correct?</p> <p>15 A. Yes.</p> <p>16 Q. Did you discuss with anybody during</p> <p>17 your investigation any of the facts or</p> <p>18 conclusions that are set forth in Paragraph 31</p> <p>19 or did you -- or is it based just on your</p> <p>20 review of Exhibit 4?</p> <p>21 A. Based on my review.</p> <p>22 Q. Okay. Are you aware that in</p> <p>23 May 2019, Mr. Dondero contemporaneously and</p> <p>24 personally paid Highland exactly \$7.4 million</p> <p>25 that was owed by Mr. Dondero to Highland under</p>
<p>Page 108</p> <p>1 D. Sauter</p> <p>2 a promissory note where he was the maker?</p> <p>3 A. I was not.</p> <p>4 Q. Nobody told you that as part of your</p> <p>5 investigation, that the way Highland was able</p> <p>6 to transfer the \$7.4 million to HCMFA was to</p> <p>7 get that money from Mr. Dondero on account of a</p> <p>8 note that he signed?</p> <p>9 A. No one told me that.</p> <p>10 Q. You're hearing that for the first</p> <p>11 time today?</p> <p>12 A. I am.</p> <p>13 Q. If Mr. Dondero paid down</p> <p>14 \$7.4 million in obligations that he owed to</p> <p>15 Highland, would it change your view that it was</p> <p>16 illogical for Highland to loan that money to</p> <p>17 HCMFA in May of 2019?</p> <p>18 A. Again, without seeing the documents</p> <p>19 and the timing and the details of the</p> <p>20 transaction, I can't answer that.</p> <p>21 Q. Okay. Now, the advisors have</p> <p>22 contracts with the funds they advise. Correct?</p> <p>23 A. Advisory agreements, yes.</p> <p>24 Q. And those advisory agreements are</p> <p>25 subject to annual renewal. Correct?</p>	<p>Page 109</p> <p>1 D. Sauter</p> <p>2 A. Yes.</p> <p>3 Q. As Nexpoint's general counsel, did</p> <p>4 you participate in the annual renewal process</p> <p>5 in the fall of 2020?</p> <p>6 A. I would have participated in the</p> <p>7 process, but only with respect to NXRT,</p> <p>8 Nexpoint Residential Trust and Nexpoint Real</p> <p>9 Estate Finance.</p> <p>10 Q. I see.</p> <p>11 A. I had some limited involvement in</p> <p>12 the 15(c) process with respect to Nexpoint's</p> <p>13 strategic opportunities fund, but very limited.</p> <p>14 Q. Do you know who the representative</p> <p>15 was for HCMFA who was responsible for the 15(c)</p> <p>16 annual renewal process in the fall of 2020?</p> <p>17 A. I don't.</p> <p>18 I can speculate, and I would assume</p> <p>19 it's Mr. -- a combination of Mr. Norris and</p> <p>20 Mr. Sella (phonetic).</p> <p>21 Q. And why do you speculate that it's a</p> <p>22 combination of them?</p> <p>23 A. Because they were actively involved</p> <p>24 in the process just from conversations I had</p> <p>25 with them.</p>

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 110</p> <p>1 D. Sauter</p> <p>2 Q. Okay. Have you ever seen any of the</p> <p>3 reports that the advisors sent to the retail</p> <p>4 board in connection with the 15(c) annual</p> <p>5 review?</p> <p>6 MR. RUKAVINA: Now, this one,</p> <p>7 Mr. Sauter, I am going to instruct you not to</p> <p>8 answer.</p> <p>9 MR. MORRIS: Have you ever seen the</p> <p>10 document? That's what, you're going to</p> <p>11 instruct him not to --</p> <p>12 MR. RUKAVINA: Don't answer that.</p> <p>13 Don't answer that. That relates to discovery</p> <p>14 and work product privilege.</p> <p>15 The document was produced to you.</p> <p>16 Mr. Sauter helped me find that document. Other</p> <p>17 than that, nothing about that document and his</p> <p>18 knowledge is fair game.</p> <p>19 MR. MORRIS: Well, I'm going to ask</p> <p>20 my questions, and you can keep directing him</p> <p>21 not to answer.</p> <p>22 BY MR. MORRIS:</p> <p>23 Q. Mr. Sauter, have you ever seen any</p> <p>24 of the reports that were issued by the advisors</p> <p>25 to the funds?</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 111</p> <p>1 D. Sauter</p> <p>2 A. Could you clarify the question.</p> <p>3 Q. Sure.</p> <p>4 Have you ever seen any of the</p> <p>5 reports that were issued by the advisors to the</p> <p>6 retail board in the fall of 2020 in connection</p> <p>7 with the 15(c) review?</p> <p>8 MR. RUKAVINA: Mr. Sauter, I'm</p> <p>9 instructing you not to answer that if your</p> <p>10 answer involves working with me in this</p> <p>11 adversary proceeding.</p> <p>12 If you saw it otherwise as part of</p> <p>13 business operation, that's fine.</p> <p>14 THE WITNESS: In the fall of 2020, I</p> <p>15 would have had -- I would not have been</p> <p>16 involved and I would not have seen anything</p> <p>17 sent to the board.</p> <p>18 BY MR. MORRIS:</p> <p>19 Q. All right. Well, let's put it up on</p> <p>20 the screen. It's, I think, a document that was</p> <p>21 previously marked as Deposition Exhibit 59.</p> <p>22 (Exhibit 59, Memo dated 10/23/20,</p> <p>23 HCMFAS 000025-031, marked for identification.)</p> <p>24 Q. Have you ever seen this document</p> <p>25 before, sir?</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 112</p> <p>1 D. Sauter</p> <p>2 A. Could you scroll down.</p> <p>3 Q. Sure.</p> <p>4 A. (Reviewing document.)</p> <p>5 Q. We can keep going.</p> <p>6 A. All right.</p> <p>7 What's the date on this?</p> <p>8 Q. October 23rd, 2020.</p> <p>9 A. I honestly don't think I would have</p> <p>10 been involved in that or seen that.</p> <p>11 Q. Okay. Did you ever ask anybody as</p> <p>12 part of your investigation -- withdrawn.</p> <p>13 Are you aware that the advisors were</p> <p>14 asked to provide information to the retail</p> <p>15 board as to the obligations that it owed to</p> <p>16 Highland and its affiliates in connection with</p> <p>17 the 15(c) annual review?</p> <p>18 A. I was not.</p> <p>19 Q. So is it fair to say that you never</p> <p>20 saw this document as part of your</p> <p>21 investigation?</p> <p>22 A. I don't think so.</p> <p>23 Q. Is it fair to say that nobody ever</p> <p>24 told you about the advisors' responses to the</p> <p>25 retail board in connection with the 15(c)</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 113</p> <p>1 D. Sauter</p> <p>2 review in October of 2020?</p> <p>3 A. I think that's accurate.</p> <p>4 MR. MORRIS: We're going to do the</p> <p>5 30(b)(6) deposition on December 1st?</p> <p>6 MR. RUKAVINA: I think I'm waiting</p> <p>7 for you to confirm.</p> <p>8 I think that's what --</p> <p>9 MR. MORRIS: Let's confirm that</p> <p>10 right now.</p> <p>11 I'll send you an e-mail, but I</p> <p>12 just...</p> <p>13 MR. RUKAVINA: Okay. 10 a.m.,</p> <p>14 Dallas?</p> <p>15 MR. MORRIS: Yeah, that sounds fair.</p> <p>16 BY MR. MORRIS:</p> <p>17 Q. All right. Let's go back to your</p> <p>18 declaration, please, Paragraph 32.</p> <p>19 I'm almost done, sir.</p> <p>20 So you state, among other things,</p> <p>21 that -- and I'm paraphrasing. Let me know if</p> <p>22 I -- if this is fair -- that as a result of</p> <p>23 your investigation in April of 2019, HCMFA now</p> <p>24 believes that it has affirmative defenses to</p> <p>25 the notes that includes the defense of mutual</p>

<p>Page 114</p> <p>1 D. Sauter</p> <p>2 mistake.</p> <p>3 Do I have that right?</p> <p>4 A. Yes.</p> <p>5 Q. Okay. What does "mutual" -- excuse</p> <p>6 me -- what does "mutual mistake" mean?</p> <p>7 MR. RUKAVINA: Are you asking for</p> <p>8 his legal opinion or how he used it in this</p> <p>9 declaration?</p> <p>10 MR. MORRIS: Only how he used it in</p> <p>11 the declaration.</p> <p>12 THE WITNESS: Well, wouldn't that be</p> <p>13 a legal conclusion because it's an affirmative</p> <p>14 defense?</p> <p>15 BY MR. MORRIS:</p> <p>16 Q. Well, I don't know. It's in your</p> <p>17 declaration. I'm just asking you what you</p> <p>18 meant when you used the phrase -- withdrawn.</p> <p>19 Let me ask a better question. Maybe</p> <p>20 it's my fault.</p> <p>21 Mr. Sauter, what did you mean when</p> <p>22 you used the phrase "mutual mistake"?</p> <p>23 A. What I meant is that there was no</p> <p>24 analysis or consideration of what had</p> <p>25 transpired and who is legally responsible for</p>	<p>Page 115</p> <p>1 D. Sauter</p> <p>2 the payments to the fund.</p> <p>3 A transfer was made. A note was</p> <p>4 executed without any analysis.</p> <p>5 Q. And do you have anything else to add</p> <p>6 to that?</p> <p>7 A. I don't think so.</p> <p>8 Q. Okay. You also say that the notes</p> <p>9 are void for lack of consideration.</p> <p>10 Do I have that right?</p> <p>11 A. Yes.</p> <p>12 Q. You don't dispute that Highland paid</p> <p>13 HCMFA \$2.4 million on May 2nd, 2019. Correct?</p> <p>14 A. No.</p> <p>15 Q. And you don't dispute that Highland</p> <p>16 paid HCMFA \$5 million on May 3rd, 2019.</p> <p>17 Correct?</p> <p>18 A. I mean, I believe that's right.</p> <p>19 That's what I've been told.</p> <p>20 So yeah, I don't dispute that.</p> <p>21 Q. Your reference to "a lack of</p> <p>22 consideration" means only that, in your</p> <p>23 opinion, the money should not have been</p> <p>24 transferred in the form of a loan.</p> <p>25 Do I have that right?</p>
<p>Page 116</p> <p>1 D. Sauter</p> <p>2 A. You do.</p> <p>3 Q. It does not mean that HCMFA did not</p> <p>4 receive an amount of money exactly equal to the</p> <p>5 principal amount of the notes. Correct?</p> <p>6 A. Based upon what I've been told,</p> <p>7 correct.</p> <p>8 Q. Okay. You also write here that</p> <p>9 Mr. Waterhouse did not "have proper authority</p> <p>10 to sign the notes."</p> <p>11 Do I have that right?</p> <p>12 A. Yes.</p> <p>13 Q. What does "proper" -- what did you</p> <p>14 mean by the phrase "proper authority"?</p> <p>15 A. I mean going through the process of</p> <p>16 what I would expect to see in making a loan of</p> <p>17 \$7.4 million.</p> <p>18 Q. So that's just your own subjective</p> <p>19 view.</p> <p>20 Is that fair?</p> <p>21 A. No.</p> <p>22 I mean, I think there's a legal</p> <p>23 basis for that, so yeah.</p> <p>24 Q. What's your legal basis for that?</p> <p>25 A. There is a process to go through in</p>	<p>Page 117</p> <p>1 D. Sauter</p> <p>2 papering a transaction like a \$7.4 million</p> <p>3 loan. And my understanding of the process, as</p> <p>4 described to me by Frank Waterhouse, was not</p> <p>5 the proper process.</p> <p>6 Q. Is there a policy or a law that</p> <p>7 requires a particular process to be followed</p> <p>8 that you're aware of?</p> <p>9 A. What I would expect is</p> <p>10 communications among the various parties that</p> <p>11 are involved and agreement that this should be</p> <p>12 a loan rather than just transferring money and</p> <p>13 sign a note.</p> <p>14 Q. You knew when you signed this</p> <p>15 declaration that Mr. Waterhouse in fact was an</p> <p>16 officer of HCMFA at the time his signature was</p> <p>17 put on the notes. Correct?</p> <p>18 A. Yes.</p> <p>19 Q. And is it your view that an officer</p> <p>20 is not authorized to execute notes on behalf of</p> <p>21 the company for which he or she works for?</p> <p>22 A. I think every company has</p> <p>23 limitations on authority.</p> <p>24 Q. And what limits are you aware of on</p> <p>25 Mr. Waterhouse -- withdrawn.</p>

<p>Page 118</p> <p>1 D. Sauter</p> <p>2 What limits are you aware of that</p> <p>3 existed on Mr. Waterhouse's authority to sign</p> <p>4 notes on behalf of HCMFA in May of 2019?</p> <p>5 A. I don't know what the HCMFA -- what</p> <p>6 the partnership agreement says, or I should say</p> <p>7 the general partnership agreement says.</p> <p>8 But what I would expect is the full</p> <p>9 participation of legal, accounting and then</p> <p>10 perhaps Mr. Dondero.</p> <p>11 Q. Do you know if Mr. Waterhouse has</p> <p>12 ever signed any other notes on behalf of HCMFA</p> <p>13 or any other affiliated entity?</p> <p>14 A. I'm sure he has.</p> <p>15 Q. Did you do -- as part of your</p> <p>16 investigation, before reaching your conclusion</p> <p>17 that Mr. Waterhouse didn't have proper</p> <p>18 authority, did you try to determine whether in</p> <p>19 fact he had previously issued notes on behalf</p> <p>20 of HCMFA or other affiliates?</p> <p>21 A. I can't answer your question without</p> <p>22 knowing the facts surrounding the execution of</p> <p>23 any particular note.</p> <p>24 I mean, I think it matters the</p> <p>25 amount of the note, the term of the note.</p>	<p>Page 119</p> <p>1 D. Sauter</p> <p>2 There's a number of factors that come into it.</p> <p>3 Q. But you didn't --</p> <p>4 A. So --</p> <p>5 Q. But you made no inquiry as to any of</p> <p>6 those issues. Correct?</p> <p>7 A. I made an inquiry of Mr. Waterhouse</p> <p>8 as it relates to this transaction.</p> <p>9 Q. Okay. And again, Mr. Waterhouse did</p> <p>10 not admit that he was not authorized to sign</p> <p>11 these notes. Correct?</p> <p>12 A. Sorry. He did not admit that he was</p> <p>13 not authorized to sign the notes, correct.</p> <p>14 Q. Okay.</p> <p>15 MR. MORRIS: Let's just take a</p> <p>16 five-minute break. I may be done.</p> <p>17 It's 4:28. Let's just come back at</p> <p>18 4:35 so I can take a break.</p> <p>19 (Recess was taken from 3:29 p.m. to</p> <p>20 3:37 p.m.)</p> <p>21 MR. MORRIS: Mr. Sauter, I greatly</p> <p>22 appreciate your time and attention today. I</p> <p>23 have no further questions.</p> <p>24 THE WITNESS: Okay.</p> <p>25 MR. RUKAVINA: I'll pass the</p>
<p>Page 120</p> <p>1 D. Sauter</p> <p>2 witness, save my questions till trial. Thank</p> <p>3 you.</p> <p>4 MR. MORRIS: Thank you, sir. Have a</p> <p>5 good day.</p> <p>6 MR. RUKAVINA: Madam Reporter, just</p> <p>7 before we're done, just to confirm, the witness</p> <p>8 does want his 30 days to read and review, so</p> <p>9 please send the transcript to me with exhibits.</p> <p>10 THE REPORTER: And Michael, do you</p> <p>11 need a copy?</p> <p>12 MR. AIGEN: Yeah, we'll order one,</p> <p>13 just regular time. Doesn't need to be</p> <p>14 expedited.</p> <p>15 (Time Noted: 3:38 p.m.)</p> <p>16</p> <p>17</p> <p>18 -----</p> <p>19 DENNIS C. SAUTER</p> <p>20</p> <p>21 Subscribed and sworn to before me</p> <p>22 this day of 2021.</p> <p>23</p> <p>24 -----</p> <p>25 Notary Public</p>	<p>Page 121</p> <p>1 District of Columbia, to wit:</p> <p>2 I, Stacey L. Daywalt, a Notary</p> <p>3 Public of the District of Columbia, do hereby</p> <p>4 certify that the within-named witness remotely</p> <p>5 appeared before me at the time and place herein</p> <p>6 set out, and after having been duly sworn by</p> <p>7 me, according to law, was examined by Counsel.</p> <p>8 I further certify that the</p> <p>9 examination was recorded stenographically by me</p> <p>10 and this transcript is a true record of the</p> <p>11 proceedings.</p> <p>12 I further certify that I am not of</p> <p>13 counsel to any of the parties, nor an employee</p> <p>14 of counsel, nor related to any of the parties,</p> <p>15 nor in any way interested in the outcome of</p> <p>16 this action.</p> <p>17 As witness my hand and Notarial Seal</p> <p>18 this 17th day of November, 2021.</p> <p>19</p> <p>20</p> <p>21 -----</p> <p>22 Stacey L. Daywalt, Notary Public</p> <p>23 My Commission Expires: 4/14/2026</p> <p>24</p> <p>25</p>

Page 122	Page 123
<div style="display: flex; justify-content: space-between;"> 1 -----I N D E X----- </div> <div style="display: flex; justify-content: space-between;"> 2 </div> <div style="display: flex; justify-content: space-between;"> 3 WITNESS EXAMINATION BY PAGE </div> <div style="display: flex; justify-content: space-between;"> 4 DENNIS C. SAUTER BY MR. MORRIS 4 </div> <div style="display: flex; justify-content: space-between;"> 5 </div> <div style="display: flex; justify-content: space-between;"> 6 -----EXHIBITS----- </div> <div style="display: flex; justify-content: space-between;"> 7 PREVIOUSLY MARKED EXHIBITS PAGE LINE </div> <div style="display: flex; justify-content: space-between;"> 8 Exhibit 181 </div> <div style="display: flex; justify-content: space-between;"> 9 Declaration of Dennis C. Sauter, </div> <div style="display: flex; justify-content: space-between;"> 10 Jr. 24 3 </div> <div style="display: flex; justify-content: space-between;"> 11 Exhibit 54 </div> <div style="display: flex; justify-content: space-between;"> 12 E-mail chain with attachment dated </div> <div style="display: flex; justify-content: space-between;"> 13 5/2/19 </div> <div style="display: flex; justify-content: space-between;"> 14 D-CNL003777-779 25 25 </div> <div style="display: flex; justify-content: space-between;"> 15 Exhibit 57 </div> <div style="display: flex; justify-content: space-between;"> 16 Promissory Note dated 5/3/19 </div> <div style="display: flex; justify-content: space-between;"> 17 D-CNL003764-65 29 5 </div> <div style="display: flex; justify-content: space-between;"> 18 Exhibit 45 </div> <div style="display: flex; justify-content: space-between;"> 19 Consolidated Financial Statements </div> <div style="display: flex; justify-content: space-between;"> 20 and Supplemental Information </div> <div style="display: flex; justify-content: space-between;"> 21 December 31, 2018 </div> <div style="display: flex; justify-content: space-between;"> 22 D-CNL002273-296 72 19 </div> <div style="display: flex; justify-content: space-between;"> 23 Exhibit 182 </div> <div style="display: flex; justify-content: space-between;"> 24 Memo dated 5/28/19 83 2 </div> <div style="display: flex; justify-content: space-between;"> 25 Exhibit 59 </div> <div style="display: flex; justify-content: space-between;"> Memo dated 10/23/20 </div> <div style="display: flex; justify-content: space-between;"> HCMFAS 000025-031 111 22 </div>	<div style="display: flex; justify-content: space-between;"> 1 NAME OF CASE: </div> <div style="display: flex; justify-content: space-between;"> 2 DATE OF DEPOSITION: </div> <div style="display: flex; justify-content: space-between;"> 3 NAME OF WITNESS: </div> <div style="display: flex; justify-content: space-between;"> 4 Reason Codes: </div> <div style="display: flex; justify-content: space-between;"> 5 1. To clarify the record. </div> <div style="display: flex; justify-content: space-between;"> 6 2. To conform to the facts. </div> <div style="display: flex; justify-content: space-between;"> 7 3. To correct transcription errors. </div> <div style="display: flex; justify-content: space-between;"> 8 Page _____ Line _____ Reason _____ </div> <div style="display: flex; justify-content: space-between;"> 9 From _____ to _____ </div> <div style="display: flex; justify-content: space-between;"> 10 Page _____ Line _____ Reason _____ </div> <div style="display: flex; justify-content: space-between;"> 11 From _____ to _____ </div> <div style="display: flex; justify-content: space-between;"> 12 Page _____ Line _____ Reason _____ </div> <div style="display: flex; justify-content: space-between;"> 13 From _____ to _____ </div> <div style="display: flex; justify-content: space-between;"> 14 Page _____ Line _____ Reason _____ </div> <div style="display: flex; justify-content: space-between;"> 15 From _____ to _____ </div> <div style="display: flex; justify-content: space-between;"> 16 Page _____ Line _____ Reason _____ </div> <div style="display: flex; justify-content: space-between;"> 17 From _____ to _____ </div> <div style="display: flex; justify-content: space-between;"> 18 Page _____ Line _____ Reason _____ </div> <div style="display: flex; justify-content: space-between;"> 19 From _____ to _____ </div> <div style="display: flex; justify-content: space-between;"> 20 Page _____ Line _____ Reason _____ </div> <div style="display: flex; justify-content: space-between;"> 21 From _____ to _____ </div> <div style="display: flex; justify-content: space-between;"> 22 Page _____ Line _____ Reason _____ </div> <div style="display: flex; justify-content: space-between;"> 23 From _____ to _____ </div> <div style="display: flex; justify-content: space-between;"> 24 </div> <div style="display: flex; justify-content: space-between;"> 25 _____ </div>

Index: \$2.4..annual

\$	2	3		
\$2.4 27:5 28:3 89:7 90:8,12 93:3 94:6,7, 14 115:13	2 28:3	30 59:6,7 62:20 68:7 71:6 120:8	accepted 8:16 79:17 80:7,23 81:3,8 96:18	17:17 18:5 19:8 20:20 21:6 28:18 29:14,25 30:25 37:3 87:22 108:21 110:3, 24 111:5 112:13
\$250,000 92:21	2001 6:10 43:17,23	30(b)(6) 113:5	accepts 81:25	advisors' 112:24
\$5 29:9 91:24 92:5,12 96:9,18 97:5 99:22 101:9,15 103:16 104:22 105:12,19 106:3 115:16	2002 6:23	31 7:9 72:21 107:3, 11,18	access 42:24 43:3 44:2,10,24 46:2	advisory 14:3,6 16:4 108:23,24
\$5.2 89:5	2006 7:2	31st 72:17 73:2	accommodate 5:23	affairs 69:25 70:4
\$7.4 63:17 82:11 95:11,23 96:20 99:15 106:13 107:8,24 108:6,14 116:17 117:2	2009 7:5,6	32 113:18	account 106:14 108:7	affiliated 12:24 13:4, 8 118:13
\$7.44 91:16,20 93:23 94:18	2014 7:10 37:14	37 82:22	accounted 41:4,8	affiliates 7:18 64:8 112:16 118:20
	2017 15:12	3:29 119:19	accounting 21:24 26:17,21,22,25 61:9, 18 64:2 77:13 78:6,7 118:9	affiliation 13:12
	2018 65:4 72:17,21 73:2	3:37 119:20	accurate 94:25 95:18 113:3	affirmative 43:13 113:24 114:13
	2019 17:2,15 18:5 21:8 26:13 28:4 29:10 32:12 35:14 36:13 37:8 69:19 73:18 87:25 89:5,17, 25 90:9 93:11 94:15 95:24 97:10 101:9 103:17 104:23 105:12 107:23 108:17 113:23 115:13,16 118:4	3:38 120:15	accurately 85:16,23	afternoon 4:12
	2020 7:12 9:6 36:5 69:20 109:5,16 111:6,14 112:8 113:2	3rd 29:10 32:12 73:17 95:24 101:9 103:16 104:23 105:12 115:16	acknowledged 65:11 80:11	agree 30:11,21 66:19 76:8,19
0		4	acknowledgment 82:7 107:6,13	agreed 77:6
000025-031 111:23		4 44:8 107:14,20	act 63:25	agreement 117:11 118:6,7
1		45 72:18,19	actively 109:23	agreements 43:5 108:23,24
10 113:13	2021 9:7,8 24:16 45:8,25 59:18,24 60:6 76:16 107:8 120:22	4:28 119:17	actual 61:10	ahead 34:23 52:5 62:15 101:6
10/23/20 111:22		4:35 119:18	add 115:5	AIGEN 120:12
11th 49:10	21 47:3,5	5	addressed 46:18	albeit 95:7
12 42:9	21st 24:16	5/2/19 26:2	admit 60:22,24 119:10,12	Allocation 16:21 83:13
13 7:9 31:15 32:6 34:11 39:3 40:13	22 46:25 47:19 50:19	5/28/19 83:2	admitted 6:6 30:11 53:11 55:4 59:15	allowed 98:2
15 6:23	23rd 112:8	5/3/19 29:6	adopted 64:25	amend 54:3 77:6 102:14
15(c) 109:12,15 110:4 111:7 112:17, 25	28 79:15,16,24	54 25:20,25	adoption 86:5	amended 24:20
15th 89:5,17,21	29 51:7	57 29:5	adversary 23:10 42:5 71:2 74:2 111:11	amendment 24:24
17 74:5	2:15 66:8	59 111:21,22	adverse 43:9	amount 32:21,24 90:17,18,20,22 92:25 93:15 116:4,5 118:25
181 24:3 25:23	2:17 67:18	9	advise 108:22	analysis 114:24 115:4
182 83:2	2:28 67:19	9th 69:19	advised 14:10 19:8	and/or 18:24 19:3
19 43:20	2nd 26:8 32:12 89:7 90:9,12 93:11 94:8, 14 95:24 115:13	A	advisor 85:10 86:22 87:11 93:2,16,18 95:7	annual 108:25 109:4, 16 110:4 112:17
1st 31:22 42:9 44:15 45:24 113:5		a.m. 113:13	advisors 7:20 12:2,6 13:7,8,20,24,25 14:3, 11,20,25 15:5 16:4	
		accept 81:13		

answering 101:5	attribute 58:25 80:3	12 64:13 80:6 97:14 116:23,24	Canty 23:17 25:18,21 82:17,25 84:22	commenced 11:3 23:11
anticipated 10:9	attributing 60:20	began 6:21 7:12	capacity 10:20 12:12 19:17 52:8	commencement 39:23 40:10 73:25
apologize 34:22 53:6 60:4 62:11,12 92:9	audio 66:19	begin 5:6,13 10:3	capital 4:15 9:19 12:2,6 20:23,25 28:17 29:13,24 30:24 31:11 69:17 89:20	comments 40:2
appeared 63:13	audited 72:5,11,15 74:7,11,25 75:8,21, 25 76:4,11,23 77:10, 22 78:14 79:7,11	begins 85:10	caps 16:10	committee 81:12 82:9
appears 59:10 60:12 61:8 63:6,7 64:14 76:6 92:2 98:11	auditors 71:6 72:2 73:14,22 78:9	behalf 81:3 117:20 118:4,12,19	careful 71:15 78:25	communicate 66:13 68:3
approved 54:22 56:19 85:12	authority 48:3 54:7, 19,25 55:5,9 116:9, 14 117:23 118:3,18	believed 50:16 51:17 96:19	carried 41:16 69:7	communications 34:7 45:22 46:23,24 79:3 117:10
approximately 9:5, 6,8 89:4,6 91:16,24 93:2	authorize 53:16	bit 10:12 11:5 16:11 26:5	carrier 100:10,24	company 96:9 100:17 117:21,22
April 6:23 9:4,6,8 43:23 45:8 113:23	authorized 54:11,16 117:20 119:10,13	Blair 27:19	case 55:8,12 64:19	compensated 79:20
area 8:3	aware 4:16 37:19,20, 21 38:7,10,11,22,25 39:9 49:24 55:11,13 56:3,8 68:12 69:12, 16,22 70:3,5 71:4,24 72:4 74:24 80:21,24 82:10 88:15 92:4,8, 11,19 97:8 100:20 101:12 106:20 107:22 112:13 117:8, 24 118:2	block 30:23	caused 39:21 79:18 81:9 82:2 86:18	compensation 95:12,25 96:21 97:11 99:16
arguing 99:2		board 45:21 46:21 83:12,16 85:13,17,24 88:12,16 110:4 111:6,17 112:15,25	caution 55:19	complaint 25:4 31:20 41:21 68:22 70:14
arose 98:21		books 40:14,18 41:5, 8 42:25 44:10,14,18, 25 70:18,22	CFO 18:7,24 19:4 51:18	compliance 36:18, 24 37:2,5,11
asks 27:5		bottom 88:23 93:7	chain 25:25 26:22	concerned 45:16
aspect 22:17		break 5:21,24 66:4, 22,25 67:3,15,24 119:16,18	change 100:2 108:15	conclude 57:8 68:17 90:16
asserted 43:13		breakdown 77:15 85:4	changed 43:16,24	concluded 47:25 81:12
assessment 96:17		bring 13:2	characterize 39:12, 14	conclusion 59:18 61:3 75:9,14,17 76:25 77:18 94:17 95:17,20,21 96:4 97:9,24 98:3,7 99:13 100:3 106:13 114:13 118:16
assets 68:14,18,24 69:8,9,25 70:8	B	brings 10:19 11:23	chart 91:19	conclusions 47:17, 22 107:18
assistant 21:13,16 23:16	back 7:6 31:16 37:8 44:24 67:5,16 79:14 85:8 93:8 107:2 113:17 119:17	broker 13:10	chief 36:24 37:2,4,11 51:2,10	conduct 95:25
assume 41:22 63:17 76:4 109:18	background 21:25 35:11	bud 67:3	circumstances 43:12 50:2	conducted 19:12 22:18 31:20 44:5,16 103:2
assumed 60:13	bad 60:4	building 34:4	cite 79:24	conference 49:9
assumption 51:4 60:19,23,24	balance 41:12,17 69:8	business 15:2 87:18 111:13	claimed 98:13,14	confirm 113:7,9 120:7
attached 27:19 107:14	bankruptcy 68:10, 13 69:18 70:7 73:22	C	clarify 14:18 39:25 52:3 111:2	confusion 52:13
attachment 26:2	based 47:14,23 59:20 63:21 71:12,16 75:12 77:19 95:9,15 107:19,21 116:6	call 49:12	clear 25:14 59:10 63:5 95:19	
attempt 5:10,12	basically 25:5	called 4:3 6:22,25 7:4,8 26:22 30:16 70:4 74:7 76:3 91:20 101:16	client 67:8 96:14	
attention 119:22	basis 21:2,20 22:7 24:23 57:8 62:9 63:2,	calling 103:2	CLOS 7:24	
attorney 4:13 9:20 96:14 104:8,11 105:16			CMFA 34:16	
attorney-client 101:20			collect 31:12 69:13	
			collectively 31:4	
			combination 109:19,22	

connection 22:21 23:10 42:5 50:7 57:11,16 69:4 92:5 99:23 110:4 111:6 112:16,25 consent 101:16 102:15 103:17,23 104:4,12,15,17 105:3,9,13,19 106:4, 6,9,11,20,21 consideration 61:10 106:23 114:24 115:9, 22 consistent 18:25 consolidated 72:19, 24 construction 8:7 consultant 85:12 contemporaneousl y 107:23 continue 61:5 99:8 103:8,10 continued 87:24 contracts 108:22 control 13:18 69:17, 23 70:6 controlling 13:19,21 controls 13:15 15:21 conversation 32:18 38:23 39:2 70:15 conversations 33:10 48:12,15,19,21 49:3 109:24 copy 27:19 83:22 120:11 corporate 26:17,21, 22,25 correct 4:19 9:12 14:5,7,8 19:14 30:4 32:3,8 33:4 40:6,12 42:18,22,23,25 43:2, 6,14,17 44:4,6 46:9, 11 47:8 50:17 51:2 52:21 53:12,13,17, 18,20 54:4,5,20 55:5, 6,9,10 57:12,14,17,	18,21,22,25 58:2,5,6, 11,12 59:15,16,19 61:4 65:25 66:2 74:3 75:4,5,18,22 79:23 80:2,4,5 81:4,6 83:17,18 84:3,10,11, 14 86:11,20,24 88:12 90:23,24 94:8 95:4 96:2 99:11,17,19,24 107:14 108:22,25 115:13,17 116:5,7 117:17 119:6,11,13 correction 64:17 correctly 51:13 61:14 79:22 counsel 4:14 8:19, 21,23 9:2,7,9,13,15, 18 10:7,20 11:25 12:5,16 14:12,14,19, 21 64:5 66:13 96:23 105:23 109:3 counsel's 103:21 couple 7:22 60:11 78:23 court 25:22 70:12 81:21 created 95:8 96:7 crosstalk 11:17 53:5 67:4,9 93:20 97:19 103:13 current 25:22 <hr/> D <hr/> D-CNL002273-296 72:21 D-CNL003764-65 29:6 D-CNL003777-779 26:2 DAF 36:8 daily 35:10 Dallas 113:14 date 69:18 73:12 74:17,18 90:17,18, 21,22 103:5 112:7	dated 26:2,7 28:3 29:5,9 32:12 73:17 83:2 111:22 David 26:7 Davor 11:19 67:7 102:6 day 6:23 10:5 29:9 120:5,22 days 71:6 120:8 DC 62:12 deal 103:9 dealer 13:10 debtor 34:6 44:9 51:11 60:14 61:12 62:5,22 63:13 64:14 68:13,17 69:7,13,23 70:7,11,18 79:10,17, 18 80:7,22 81:3,8,24 107:6 debtor's 43:4 63:3 68:7,10,23 80:9 December 7:9 17:15 72:17,21 73:2 113:5 decision 57:24 decisions 57:16 declaration 23:9 24:3,8,19,23 25:3,23 31:15 50:16,24 51:9, 16 52:19,24 53:3,10, 14 54:2 55:3,8 58:24 59:4 61:25 62:3 68:9, 25 69:5 75:4 79:14 81:15 84:13 91:12 92:9,14,17,20 96:25 97:4 98:10,22 99:11, 21 100:4,21 101:24 102:3 103:6 107:3 113:18 114:9,11,17 117:15 deductible 92:21 defense 11:2 113:25 114:14 defenses 43:13 113:24 define 13:18 85:16 defined 21:17 28:16 30:12,22 86:10	defines 29:13 definition 30:3 85:24 denied 45:3 Dennis 4:11 24:3 120:19 deny 50:9 department 9:19 63:23 64:5,6,12 depends 13:17 depicts 91:19 deposed 4:24 55:12 deposition 4:19 55:14 66:14 72:18 111:21 113:5 depositions 25:17 describe 6:17 45:12 85:23 describes 25:3 83:15 description 74:21 detail 32:19 details 108:19 determination 63:24 78:8 80:15 86:4,23 100:8 determine 18:10,13 19:16 20:12 41:4,16 100:16 118:18 development 7:4 developments 70:25 difficult 34:7 direct 103:9 directing 110:20 directly 15:5 director 10:2 disagree 58:16 disagreed 58:15 disagrees 57:6 disclose 52:20	disclosed 68:13 71:5,25 discloses 99:22 disclosing 68:18 discovery 110:13 discrete 7:23 15:2 discuss 60:6 83:19 107:16 discussed 98:23 discussion 43:21 56:15 discussions 22:9 48:6 50:8 55:22 59:21,23 60:2 63:21 91:5 95:10,16 102:18 104:19 dispute 115:12,15,20 disputes 8:8 distinction 63:8 document 23:21 24:7 25:19 30:10,13 47:20 59:25 65:7,20 70:4 71:20 73:10,21 84:25 99:10,20 110:10,15,16,17 111:20,24 112:4,20 documents 15:24 23:17 25:16 42:4,13 45:4,5,10,13 46:14 59:21 68:16 70:7 108:18 Dondero 13:14 15:9 16:2 17:4 32:2 33:11 34:3 39:4,8,17 40:8 42:17 46:6 54:22 59:24 60:7 69:16,23 70:5 104:21 107:23, 25 108:7,13 118:10 draft 30:6,7 duly 4:4 11:18 Dustin 34:19 47:13 84:6 duties 10:6
--	--	--	---	--

<p>E</p> <p>e-mail 25:25 26:7,17, 21,22,24 27:4 113:11</p> <p>e-mails 48:18</p> <p>earlier 37:14 72:8 90:11</p> <p>effort 20:11 41:3,15</p> <p>electronic 53:23</p> <p>Ellington 9:18</p> <p>employed 8:12 20:20,21,22,24</p> <p>employee 34:24</p> <p>employees 21:5 23:8 34:12,17 43:4,9, 25 80:10,12 81:11 82:8</p> <p>employment 6:18</p> <p>end 44:8</p> <p>ending 72:16,25</p> <p>engagements 7:23</p> <p>entire 8:15</p> <p>entities 12:25 13:8 15:3 87:24</p> <p>entity 12:7 13:4 86:23 118:13</p> <p>equal 116:4</p> <p>equity 16:18</p> <p>error 22:10 45:11 46:8 50:7 63:20 64:16,20 65:9,22 79:18 81:4,9 82:2,7 83:16 85:4,17,24 86:11 88:5,8,17 91:16 92:5 94:20 95:6,9,12,22 96:6 99:24 100:11,18 106:15</p> <p>errors 86:6</p> <p>estate 8:5,9,10,20,22 9:8,15 14:14,20 68:14,18 70:8 109:9</p> <p>estimated 91:15 94:19</p>	<p>event 15:11 78:9,10</p> <p>events 51:12 74:8, 11,16 75:3</p> <p>evicted 34:4,5</p> <p>evidentiary 98:6</p> <p>exact 52:22 54:9</p> <p>EXAMINATION 4:7</p> <p>examined 4:4,21</p> <p>exclude 79:2</p> <p>excuse 114:5</p> <p>execute 117:20</p> <p>executed 50:6 58:20,23 64:7 74:19 75:3 95:4 107:6 115:4</p> <p>executing 58:10</p> <p>execution 50:3 52:13 71:7 75:18 76:25 118:22</p> <p>exhibit 24:3 25:20,25 29:5 72:18,19 82:22 83:2 107:14,20 111:21,22</p> <p>exhibits 120:9</p> <p>existed 118:3</p> <p>existence 37:21,25 38:22,25 39:9,18,22 40:9 50:13 71:5,25</p> <p>expect 116:16 117:9 118:8</p> <p>expedited 120:14</p> <p>expenses 63:20</p> <p>experience 78:5</p> <p>expert 30:16 76:13 77:4,5,25 85:12,21 94:22 98:15 106:17</p> <p>expertise 8:2 13:2 21:11</p> <p>explain 98:4</p> <p>extension 41:20</p> <p>extent 104:7 105:15</p>	<p>F</p> <p>fact 50:15,17 53:15 59:4,19 63:7 64:11 69:7 81:19 97:25 117:15 118:19</p> <p>factors 119:2</p> <p>facts 101:25 102:2 107:17 118:22</p> <p>factual 24:23 71:17 76:15 98:7,24 103:6, 11</p> <p>factually 102:5,10,12</p> <p>fail 5:14</p> <p>fair 5:8,25 6:2 10:11 24:22 25:2 30:20 40:5,11 47:14,16,23 61:3 66:15 86:5 90:15 98:7 107:4 110:18 112:19,23 113:15,22 116:20</p> <p>fairly 10:18</p> <p>fall 109:5,16 111:6,14</p> <p>false 86:14,19</p> <p>familiar 16:13</p> <p>fault 114:20</p> <p>February 7:12 9:6 89:5,17,21,25</p> <p>fee 101:16 103:17,23 104:4,12,15,17 105:3,9,13,19 106:4, 6,9,12,20,22</p> <p>feel 99:4</p> <p>fees 63:19</p> <p>file 24:20</p> <p>filed 25:4 31:21 42:3, 8,14,16 43:12 53:25 55:7,9 69:24 70:7</p> <p>filing 69:18 70:13 73:22</p> <p>filings 68:10 70:12</p> <p>Finance 14:14 109:9</p> <p>financial 51:2,10 69:25 70:4 72:6,12,</p>	<p>16,19,25 74:7,12 75:2,8,21,25 76:11, 23 77:22 78:14,18 79:7,12</p> <p>financials 74:17,18 76:4 77:11</p> <p>find 40:24,25 110:16</p> <p>fine 11:12 14:2 25:24 30:20 31:6 66:5,10 111:13</p> <p>finish 5:6,12</p> <p>firm 6:21,24 7:4 76:2 87:4</p> <p>firms 14:4</p> <p>five-minute 119:16</p> <p>floor 49:10</p> <p>fluid 10:18</p> <p>focus 68:6</p> <p>folks 8:14 13:11 78:6,7</p> <p>follow 103:20 106:4 107:12</p> <p>follow-up 45:7</p> <p>foreclosures 8:9</p> <p>form 17:21 30:15 54:10 56:6 62:10,13 64:9 69:11 71:8 75:12 99:16,18 115:24</p> <p>formation 10:16</p> <p>formed 81:11</p> <p>formulating 22:25</p> <p>Frank 17:10 22:9 26:15 29:24 46:4 63:21 80:15 117:4</p> <p>full 84:20 118:8</p> <p>function 80:10</p> <p>fund 12:2,6 16:21 21:16 28:17 29:14,25 30:24 57:25 82:11,12 83:13 86:7 91:20,21 92:6 109:13 115:2</p> <p>funded 91:24</p>	<p>funding 89:11,16 94:2</p> <p>funds 14:7,10,24 15:3 16:3,19 19:7,18 20:5,9 60:14 64:3 71:20 79:20 82:24 108:22 110:25</p> <p>G</p> <p>GAF 16:23 17:2,8 20:13 21:13,17 36:10 57:25 58:4,22 64:3 65:16 92:6 93:2,13, 23 94:15 95:6</p> <p>game 98:7 110:18</p> <p>gave 8:16 83:25</p> <p>general 8:19,21,23, 25 9:7,9,13,14,18 10:7,20 11:25 12:5, 15 14:12,13,19,21 64:4 109:3 118:7</p> <p>generally 9:17 13:6 16:13,15 37:18 70:2 78:5 97:2 102:9</p> <p>genesis 32:6 33:3 37:20 38:8 39:4,10 42:17,21</p> <p>gentleman 20:16</p> <p>give 8:17 23:19 51:5 56:21 66:6</p> <p>Global 16:20 83:13</p> <p>Godwin 6:25</p> <p>good 4:12 11:24 87:5 120:5</p> <p>Gould 7:11</p> <p>graduate 6:11,14</p> <p>graduated 6:18</p> <p>granted 45:2 102:15</p> <p>great 75:16</p> <p>greatly 119:21</p> <p>ground 5:3</p> <p>group 6:24 7:7 19:25 26:18,23,25</p>
--	---	---	---	--

Gruber 6:25 7:2	100:10,17	illogical 107:7 108:16	instruction 102:23	invited 15:12
guess 13:17 37:7 39:25 52:3 70:2	heard 78:23	imagine 10:15	instructions 103:21	involved 57:13,15,20 63:23 64:6 109:23 111:16 112:10 117:11
<hr/> H <hr/>	hearing 108:10	implied 57:2 58:9	insurance 79:19 91:25 92:12,21 96:9, 18 97:5 98:21 99:23 100:6,10,17,20,23	involvement 57:24 58:4 109:11
handle 10:19	held 16:19 18:4,11,14 20:5,8,12 21:7 35:14 36:13 43:21	important 5:5 23:19	insured 16:22	involves 111:10
happened 57:11	helped 110:16	importantly 98:18	intact 99:6	irrelevant 88:20
happening 35:8	Hendrix 27:13,15	improper 30:23 43:8	intended 30:24 74:16	issuance 75:10
hard 38:18	Hey 67:7	in-house 7:3	intent 68:7	issue 16:8,12,17 19:13,23 45:17 57:12,14 66:19 98:20 102:12,13,16
HCMFA 11:7 12:8, 11,13,14,15,18,23 13:6,9,13,22,23 15:14,20,21 16:19 18:11,14,19 19:4,19 21:6 23:11 27:6 31:21 34:12,24 35:14,19 36:2,5,13, 16 37:5 40:15 41:4,7, 16,19,24 42:4,8,12, 16,24 43:3,5,12 44:10 45:23 48:3 51:11 57:24 58:4,21 60:15 61:12 62:5,22 65:16 69:14 70:22 71:4,25 72:24 75:7, 20 76:22 78:13 79:5, 17,20 80:8 81:9,25 82:11,12,24 83:12,15 85:16,23 87:16,21 88:12,16 89:14 91:21 92:4,13,20 93:23 94:7,14 95:7,11,23 96:8,17 99:22 100:9, 16,22 101:9,15 103:16 104:5,13,17, 22 105:9,13 106:3,14 107:5,8 108:6,17 109:15 113:23 115:13,16 116:3 117:16 118:4,5,12,20	Highland 4:15 7:17, 24 9:18 11:2 12:2,6 20:23,25 21:8 23:6, 11 25:7 26:21 28:17 29:13,24 30:24 31:11 42:13 43:25 44:15 64:7 69:17,24 70:6 71:5,25 83:13 94:7, 13,18 95:5,8,11,22 96:6,11,20 97:10 99:14 104:4,11,14, 16,22 105:8 106:14, 15 107:7,24,25 108:5,15,16 112:16 115:12,15	include 74:15 78:10	intention 61:11 62:4, 22 63:13 64:14	issued 74:19 110:24 111:5 118:19
	Highland's 73:22	includes 113:25	intentions 63:3	issues 58:8 60:7 119:6
	hired 8:19 10:5 87:13	including 75:7 77:22	intents 13:20	Ives 7:4
	historical 35:8	inconsistent 76:9	interco 27:9	<hr/> J <hr/>
	history 6:18	incorrect 60:23,25 79:8	interject 11:4	January 69:19
	hold 14:9 15:16,19 90:6	incorrectly 60:13 62:17	internal 46:23 61:9, 17 64:16	Jason 34:25 37:11 47:12
	holds 15:13 17:17 18:19 19:6 36:7,9,15	indemnity 96:5	internally 63:18 78:6	Jim 32:2
	honestly 112:9	independent 73:14 76:2 85:11	interrupting 34:22	job 36:22
	Houlihan 85:11 87:2, 3,14,17,20,25 88:4,7	indirectly 15:5	interview 80:17	John 4:13 11:5 25:21 62:11 82:17 97:17
	hybrid 8:7	inform 46:7 79:6	interviews 49:19	joined 7:25
HCMFA's 22:25 41:11 50:25 51:17 54:2 57:20 72:5,15 73:21 74:25 89:16,20	<hr/> I <hr/>	information 19:21 40:7 71:17 72:20 92:16 107:11 112:14	investigating 28:24 31:8	Jones 4:14
HCMFAS 111:23	idea 46:9	informed 100:10	investigation 17:6 18:9 19:12,16,23 20:11 22:18,22 25:3, 6,10 28:23 31:17,19 32:2 33:12 34:18 37:16 40:20 44:6,17 45:7 46:15 47:6,11, 18,24 48:7 51:20,25 54:6 60:9 70:11 72:13 76:15 77:20 80:18 83:9,20 86:18 90:16 91:7 92:3 94:13 96:16,24 97:2, 23,24 98:24 100:15 101:8,11,23 102:21 103:3 104:20 105:25 106:7 107:17 108:5 112:12,21 113:23 118:16	Jr 24:4
HCMLP 27:6 37:11 42:4 43:10 58:22 64:19 65:8,13,21 81:11 82:8 87:11,21 88:16 89:23,25 90:10	identification 24:5 26:3 29:7 72:22 83:3 111:23	initial 31:17,18,25 33:11 34:18 37:16 40:19 45:6 60:8 101:10	investigations 65:20	June 73:17
	identified 82:3,4	initially 25:4		<hr/> K <hr/>
	identify 34:16 45:5	input 77:12		kicked 34:5
		inquiry 119:5,7		kind 8:6 59:8
		instruct 96:12 97:12 101:18 103:18 105:14 110:7,11		Klos 26:7,10,12 27:5, 17
		instructed 104:6		knew 18:16 40:8 49:21,23 117:14
		instructing 98:19,25 111:9		knowing 118:22

knowledge 12:16,19 13:16 21:24 22:10 27:16 35:9,20 36:19 37:17 41:23 57:10 58:8 76:14 78:2 81:2, 5 85:16,21 87:23 88:11 94:23 98:14 102:17 106:18 110:18 Kristin 27:13 <hr/> L <hr/> lack 115:9,21 landlord-tenant 8:8 Langley 7:8,9 law 6:4,11,14,19,21 8:3 30:11 64:5 66:18, 20 117:6 lawsuit 11:2,7 39:23 40:10 lawyer 30:10,17 learn 19:22 69:6 78:17 94:13 learned 37:25 39:18 92:7 97:25 101:22 102:19 105:15 106:2 learning 78:20 106:11 leave 54:3 leaving 10:17 led 49:22 68:17 left 23:6 36:21 legal 9:19 12:25 63:22 64:6,12 75:14 114:8,13 116:22,24 118:9 legally 114:25 lend 107:8 liabilities 41:17 68:24 69:9 license 6:3,9 limit 66:9 limitations 117:23	limited 40:14 42:24 102:3,14 109:11,13 limits 117:24 118:2 lines 45:19 60:11 listed 82:22 93:21 litany 45:3 literally 40:23 litigation 8:7,10 10:22 102:20 LLP 12:2 loan 27:9 60:14 61:13 62:6,23 63:15 95:12 96:2 97:11 99:16 108:16 115:24 116:16 117:3,12 local 66:8 Lokey 85:11 87:2,3, 14,20,25 88:4,8 Lokey's 87:17 longest 49:3 looked 30:10 40:21 77:16 loss 91:15 94:19 losses 57:25 lot 10:9 34:2 35:7 lots 10:13 49:8 LP 4:15 13:24 15:6 20:23,25 28:18 29:14 69:17 <hr/> M <hr/> Mabry 20:17,19,21 22:11,16,20,24 25:7 47:7 Mabry's 21:11 Madam 120:6 made 34:4,6 40:3 53:11 56:5,9,17,25 57:4,8,16,19 58:10 59:10 60:19 64:19 75:7 78:7 80:11 81:13 82:7 86:23 89:5,7,25 93:11,13	95:5,13 96:10 97:10, 24 99:14 105:13 106:15 115:3 119:5,7 make 20:11 25:14 40:2 41:3,15 89:16, 20 93:2 96:4,17,22 100:7 maker 28:16 29:13, 23 30:3,12,22 108:2 making 59:15 63:23 95:6,22 116:16 manage 14:25 managed 7:24 16:19 19:18 Management 4:15 12:2,6 20:23,25 28:17 29:14,25 30:24 31:12 69:17 manager 16:3 17:2,7 managing 10:2 March 31:22 42:9 44:15 45:24 marked 24:4 25:19 26:3 29:6 72:18,22 83:3 111:21,23 Martin 7:11 matched 90:18,21 matches 93:6 math 93:5 Matt 9:24 matter 43:9 matters 10:22 118:24 Mcgraner 9:24 10:4 Mcgraner's 9:25 means 115:22 meant 114:18,23 meet 12:25 15:9 17:12 memo 45:20 65:6 82:23 83:2,12,19 84:9,13,17,20 86:25 88:11,14,16 93:12 111:22	memory 38:20 memos 45:14,15,24 46:3,13,17 65:10,13, 15 83:5,8 mentioned 105:20 met 15:11 17:14 Methodist 6:16 methodology 86:6 Michael 120:10 mid-april 43:17 44:16 middle 34:13 migrated 25:7 43:25 million 27:5 28:3 29:9 63:17 82:11 89:5,7 90:8,12 91:16, 20,24 92:5,12 93:3, 23 94:6,7,14,18 95:11,23 96:9,18,20 97:5 99:15,22 101:9, 15 103:16 104:22 105:12,19 106:3,13 107:8,24 108:6,14 115:13,16 116:17 117:2 Minick 6:22 ministerial 63:25 minutes 49:14 66:9 67:6,16 misleading 86:14,19 mistake 48:2 50:21 51:22 52:2,17 53:11 56:5,10,18,25 57:4,8 58:10 59:11,15 65:11,14 75:7,10,18 76:10 77:2,21 78:4 80:11 81:13 84:5 95:4 98:12,17 99:14 106:14 114:2,6,22 mix 48:22,24 moment 51:6 money 56:22 58:20, 21 61:23 108:7,16 115:23 116:4 117:12 Morris 4:8,13 11:10, 15,18,22 16:9 17:23,	24 18:2 25:24 30:20 31:2 56:2 62:16,18 63:9,11 66:21 67:2,7, 17,20 69:15 71:21 76:17 77:8 78:11 82:20 83:4 88:21 95:2 97:7,14,20,23 99:7,9 101:25 102:24 103:14 104:9 110:9, 19,22 111:18 113:4, 9,15,16 114:10,15 119:15,21 120:4 motion 54:3 77:5 102:14 move 88:21 moved 6:24 moving 35:12 mutual 113:25 114:5, 6,22 <hr/> N <hr/> N-A-V 16:10 named 20:16 27:19 NAV 16:8,12,17 19:13 22:10 45:11,16 46:8 50:7 63:20 64:16,20 65:9,22 79:18 81:4,9 82:2,7 83:16 85:3,16,24 86:6,11 88:17 91:15 92:5 94:19 95:5,9,22 99:14,24 100:11,18 106:15 necessarily 15:3 needed 71:19 81:13 92:25 101:9,15 103:16 negligent 95:22,25 96:3 net 91:15 94:19 Nexbank 34:10 49:10 Nexpoint 7:13,14,20 8:2,13,15,24 9:2,10, 14 10:8 11:9 13:6,8, 9,13,20,24 14:13,14, 20 15:5,16,17 21:5
---	---	---	--	--

Index: Nexpoint's..prepare

37:3 64:5 87:21 109:8		ordinary 87:18	83:9,20 90:16 96:16 98:24 99:23 100:15 104:19 105:25 108:4 111:12 112:12,20 118:15	phase 25:5 44:6,16 47:6,11,15,17,24
Nexpoint's 10:22,25 109:3,12	O	organizational 15:24		Phillips 7:11,12,16 8:15
nonlawyer 71:17	oath 66:12	origin 25:10	participate 109:4	phone 33:19 34:9 48:22 49:12
Norris 34:20 35:3,10, 13 36:7,9 37:15 42:20 46:7 47:13 59:22 84:7 95:10,16 104:20 105:6,7,20 106:2,8,12 109:19	object 17:20 30:14 62:10,13 63:4 64:9 69:10 72:3 75:11 76:12 77:3,24 101:17 106:16	original 31:22 42:3	participated 109:6	phonetic 109:20
Notary 4:4 120:25	objection 56:6 63:10 71:8 85:18 94:9,21 99:4,18	origins 28:24	participation 118:9	phrase 31:18 114:18, 22 116:14
note 27:20 28:3,15 29:3,5,8 30:6 61:24 64:6 69:13 71:19 90:18,19,22 108:2,8 115:3 117:13 118:23, 25	obtain 6:9 83:22	overlap 11:21	parties 117:10	pick 74:16
noted 11:18 120:15	obligates 64:17	overseeing 10:21,25 78:13	partnership 118:6,7	pin 33:9
notes 25:11,14 28:22,24 31:4,7,11 32:7,9,11,16,21,24 33:6 37:17,19,20,22, 25 38:3,7,10,12,15, 22,25 39:5,9,11,18, 22 40:9,25 41:5,8,16 42:18,21 46:9 47:25 48:14 49:18,21,23,24 50:3,6,10,13,17,20, 25 51:9,12,18,22 52:2,7,14,17,25 53:8, 12,17,20 54:8,12,19, 22,25 55:5,9 56:5,10, 18,20,23 58:10,21,23 60:7 61:8,11,13,17, 21 62:5,21,23 63:14, 25 64:15 68:13,18 69:7,14 70:8,12,18, 22 71:5,11 72:2 74:22,25 75:7,10,18, 20 76:9 77:2,21 78:8, 18 79:11 90:12 95:4 113:25 115:8 116:5, 10 117:17,20 118:4, 12,19 119:11,13	obtained 92:4,13 94:7	owed 107:25 108:14 112:15	parts 35:12	piss 67:15
	obtaining 44:24	owned 7:20 13:7 15:4	party 64:18 85:11 87:4	place 33:18 48:22 65:4
	occasion 7:22	owns 13:9	pass 119:25	play 26:13
	occurred 74:17 77:16,21	P	past 64:12 87:22	played 22:16,20,24
	October 36:5 69:19 112:8 113:2	p.m. 67:18,19 119:19, 20 120:15	pay 58:21 64:3,18 94:15 101:16 103:17 105:13 106:3	pocket 93:15,18
	odds 76:20	Pachulski 4:13	payable 98:21	point 11:24 18:16 34:3 91:8 99:2
	offer 8:16,17	paid 60:14 82:11 92:20 93:23 95:11,23 96:20 104:5,12,17,22 106:3,13,22,23 107:24 108:13 115:12,16	paying 104:15	policy 64:17,21,24 65:3,5 82:5,6 100:6 117:6
	office 33:25 34:10 49:11	papering 117:2	payment 63:19 89:4, 6,11,17,21 90:8,17, 21 91:21 92:6 93:10, 13 97:10 98:20 99:15 105:3,8,12	portfolio 16:3,25 17:7
	officer 36:18,25 37:2, 5,11 51:2,10 117:16, 19	paragraph 31:15 32:6 34:11,14 39:3 40:13 42:9 43:20 46:25 47:3,5,19 50:19 51:7 59:6,7 62:20 68:7 74:21 79:15,16,24 85:10, 13,17 88:24 93:7 107:3,5,11,18 113:18	payments 79:21 89:2 97:6 115:2	portion 88:22 92:24 100:23
	officers 12:18	paraphrasing 98:11 113:21	pending 5:24	position 8:18 18:4, 19,23 20:9 21:7 35:14,17,19,23
	official 12:12	Pardon 98:8	people 10:14,17 13:2	positions 16:18 19:7 20:5,12 36:8,10,13, 16 37:8
	operation 111:13	parse 59:8	perfectly 66:5	Post 34:25 35:10 36:12,13,18 37:15 42:20 46:7 47:13 59:21 83:24,25 95:10,16 104:20
	opinion 114:8 115:23	part 22:4,8,12 31:16 33:11 34:17 40:19 45:6 46:15 47:5,11 48:6 49:18 60:8 61:12 62:4,22 70:10 72:12 75:21 80:18	perform 12:13	potentially 43:8
	opportunities 109:13		performed 64:2 80:10	practice 6:4,7 30:11
	opportunity 23:20		period 69:24 72:16, 25	premarked 25:18,23
November 6:10	order 23:21 101:15 120:12		person 13:19,21 33:19,20,22,24 48:22 80:4	preparation 69:4 78:14
number 93:4,6,7 119:2	orderly 86:4,23		personal 52:7 57:10 58:8 76:14 78:2 81:2, 5 85:21 94:23 98:14 106:18	prepare 52:10
NXRT 109:7			personally 57:13 107:24	

<p>prepared 61:8,17 62:21 68:8 71:11 73:21,25 76:6 77:11 106:25</p> <p>preparing 59:25</p> <p>present 33:15 48:11</p> <p>preserve 30:18</p> <p>president 15:18 35:24 36:2,4</p> <p>prevented 102:11</p> <p>previously 4:21 24:4 26:3 29:6 72:17,21 77:14 83:3 111:21 118:19</p> <p>Pricewaterhouseco opers 73:15 76:3,7 77:12 79:6</p> <p>primarily 7:19</p> <p>principal 32:20,24 116:5</p> <p>prior 7:25 38:12,23 39:2,22 40:9 42:2 68:24 73:22,25 74:18 92:8</p> <p>privilege 101:21 110:14</p> <p>privileged 96:14</p> <p>proceed 67:21 96:18</p> <p>proceeding 23:10 42:5 71:2 74:2 111:11</p> <p>proceeds 91:25 92:12 96:19 99:23 100:6,20,23</p> <p>process 44:22 56:20,22 63:18,22 77:15 109:4,7,12,16, 24 116:15,25 117:3, 5,7</p> <p>produced 110:15</p> <p>product 96:15 98:23 101:21 110:14</p> <p>professional 97:17</p> <p>prohibited 80:19</p>	<p>promissory 25:11 28:3 29:5 30:6 108:2</p> <p>proper 116:9,13,14 117:5 118:17</p> <p>proposed 24:24</p> <p>provide 7:17 12:22 14:6 16:4 42:4 44:15 112:14</p> <p>provided 7:19 43:4 44:9</p> <p>Public 4:4 120:25</p> <p>purely 103:6</p> <p>purports 73:23,24</p> <p>purpose 24:18 25:9 61:9,18,20</p> <p>purposes 13:21</p> <p>put 23:15,17,23 25:18 31:16 67:17 72:15 82:16 111:19 117:17</p> <hr/> <p style="text-align: center;">Q</p> <hr/> <p>qualified 94:10</p> <p>question 5:6,13,24 17:25 20:7 60:5 65:18 66:17 67:8 71:23 75:12,16 76:24 97:9,15 102:16 106:12 111:2 114:19 118:21</p> <p>questions 5:5 10:13 99:8 103:5,7,11 110:20 119:23 120:2</p> <p>quick 66:4</p> <hr/> <p style="text-align: center;">R</p> <hr/> <p>raised 38:2</p> <p>ran 20:2</p> <p>reach 43:8</p> <p>reached 79:5 100:3</p> <p>reaching 59:18 118:16</p> <p>read 23:21 51:13 61:14 62:17 79:22</p>	<p>85:13 120:8</p> <p>ready 67:21</p> <p>real 8:4,9,10,20,22 9:7,15 14:14,20 109:8</p> <p>Realty 7:4</p> <p>reason 81:20 85:22 86:2,13 93:25</p> <p>recall 9:3 15:10 18:17 20:15 21:22 22:13,15 23:5 27:2 32:6,10,13,18 33:3, 13,17,18 34:21 35:17 38:9,21,24 39:4,10 40:21 41:14 42:15, 17,21 44:21,23 45:15 46:14 48:13,16,17,20 49:2,20 54:23 58:17 60:10 65:23,24 68:19 72:7,9,11 90:13 91:9</p> <p>receive 116:4</p> <p>received 26:20 99:22</p> <p>receiving 27:2</p> <p>recess 67:18 119:19</p> <p>recollection 32:15, 25 33:5 35:2 46:10 51:15 57:3,5 65:12</p> <p>reconsider 75:9</p> <p>record 4:10 25:14 30:19 43:22 66:7 67:17</p> <p>records 40:14,18 41:5,9 42:25 44:11, 14,19,25 70:19,23</p> <p>refer 12:7 13:6,23 16:23 31:3</p> <p>reference 44:9 79:11 88:25 115:21</p> <p>referenced 96:25</p> <p>referring 44:19 64:22</p> <p>refrained 43:10</p> <p>refresh 32:15 51:15</p> <p>regular 120:13</p> <p>reimbursement</p>	<p>96:6</p> <p>related 8:7,9 16:18 32:25 33:6 40:24 45:11 46:9</p> <p>relates 98:20 110:13 119:8</p> <p>remained 21:6</p> <p>remember 24:18</p> <p>renewal 108:25 109:4,16</p> <p>reorganized 4:15</p> <p>report 9:23 73:13 82:12</p> <p>reported 9:20 58:4 76:10</p> <p>reporter 11:20 25:22 120:6,10</p> <p>reporting 10:3 75:20</p> <p>reports 110:3,24 111:5</p> <p>representative 109:14</p> <p>represented 105:23</p> <p>reputation 87:5</p> <p>requested 41:19</p> <p>requesting 24:20</p> <p>requests 45:2</p> <p>requires 66:20 117:7</p> <p>Residential 14:13 109:8</p> <p>resolution 83:16</p> <p>respect 109:7,12</p> <p>respond 41:20</p> <p>response 22:25 27:11 52:4,9 54:15 57:21 58:14</p> <p>responses 112:24</p> <p>responsibilities 10:7</p> <p>responsibility 10:21,25 57:20,23 58:3 79:17 80:7,23</p>	<p>81:4,8,25 105:8</p> <p>responsible 63:19 64:18 65:8,14,21 78:13 88:4,8,17 94:18 95:6 100:11,18 104:4,12,14,16 109:15 114:25</p> <p>restate 17:25 62:17</p> <p>restroom 66:25</p> <p>result 113:22</p> <p>resulted 47:17 86:6</p> <p>resulting 91:15 94:19</p> <p>retail 110:3 111:6 112:14,25</p> <p>retained 87:10</p> <p>returned 100:22</p> <p>Returning 51:9</p> <p>review 40:19 59:20 68:16 69:3 107:20,21 110:5 111:7 112:17 113:2 120:8</p> <p>reviewed 40:14 41:11 45:6,10,16 55:14 68:23 69:5 88:14</p> <p>reviewing 46:14 47:20 68:9 69:6 83:21 84:25 112:4</p> <p>rights 99:5</p> <p>role 12:10 22:17,21, 25 26:13 102:14</p> <p>room 49:10</p> <p>row 91:14</p> <p>rude 11:13</p> <p>Rukavina 11:4,12, 16,23 17:20 30:14 55:19 56:6 62:10 63:4 64:9 66:16,24 67:5,10 69:10 71:8, 14 72:3 75:11 76:12 77:3,24 78:25 85:18, 20 94:9,21 96:12,22 97:12,16,22 98:4 99:18 101:4,17 102:7 103:12,18 104:6</p>
--	---	---	---	---

Index: ruled..T-E-R-R-A-S-T-A-R

105:14 106:16 110:6, 12 111:8 113:6,13 114:7 119:25 120:6	scroll 23:24 26:4 43:19 46:25 84:23 93:8 112:2	117:13 118:3 119:10, 13	80:19	subjective 116:18
ruled 77:6	search 38:19	signature 24:10,12 28:7,9,11,13 29:18, 20,22 30:23 53:17,23 117:16	specific 20:14 58:18, 25	submitted 23:9 45:21
rules 5:3	SEC 22:18,21 23:2 45:22 46:24 57:21	signed 48:2 50:17, 20,24,25 51:12,16, 18,21,25 52:7,25 53:20 54:16,19,25 56:23 68:25 84:13 92:9,13,17,20 99:11, 21 108:8 117:14 118:12	specifically 20:4 50:20 65:13 72:10	submitting 44:25
S	Sechrest 6:22	signing 50:9,15 52:16 53:11,16 55:5 56:5,10,18 77:21	speculate 109:18,21	subpoena 102:4
Sauter 4:1,11,12 5:1 6:1 7:1 8:1 9:1 10:1 11:1,6,23 12:1 13:1 14:1 15:1 16:1 17:1 18:1,3 19:1 20:1 21:1 22:1 23:1,18 24:1,4 25:1 26:1 27:1 28:1 29:1 30:1 31:1 32:1 33:1 34:1 35:1 36:1 37:1 38:1,18 39:1 40:1 41:1 42:1 43:1 44:1 45:1 46:1 47:1 48:1 49:1 50:1 51:1 52:1 53:1 54:1 55:1, 20 56:1 57:1 58:1 59:1 60:1 61:1 62:1, 19 63:1,5 64:1 65:1 66:1,9,17 67:1,22 68:1 69:1 70:1 71:1, 14 72:1 73:1 74:1 75:1 76:1 77:1 78:1 79:1,2 80:1 81:1 82:1 83:1,6 84:1 85:1 86:1 87:1 88:1 89:1 90:1 91:1 92:1 93:1 94:1 95:1 96:1,23 97:1,13 98:1 99:1 100:1 101:1,5 102:1,23 103:1,15,19 104:1 105:1 106:1 107:1 108:1 109:1 110:1,7, 16,23 111:1,8 112:1 113:1 114:1,21 115:1 116:1 117:1 118:1 119:1,21 120:1,19	section 74:6,11,15	simultaneous 11:17 53:5 67:4,9 93:20 97:19 103:13	speculating 18:8 19:9	subpoenaed 11:6
	Securities 13:9	sir 4:17,20 5:9 6:4 12:9 14:16 15:7 16:24 23:13 24:13,17 25:12 28:11 76:18 77:9 96:16 99:10 103:24 106:19 111:25 113:19 120:4	speculation 21:3	Subscribed 120:21
	Sella 109:20	sit 71:24	spend 68:9	subsequent 74:7,11 75:2 78:9,10
	send 113:11 120:9	sitting 32:19	spent 49:6	subsequently 92:7
	sense 49:5	situation 43:16,23	spoke 32:2 34:12,17 47:7 84:4	subset 19:25
	sentence 44:20 59:9 62:19 86:3,14,19	skills 21:11	spoken 34:8,19 47:12 105:21	subsidiaries 7:21 13:7
	separate 14:23 15:2	Skyview 10:16 21:4 44:2	St 7:4	substance 54:11 55:22 66:14 67:25 68:4 84:3,9
	series 5:4	sought 69:13	Stacey 16:9	suggest 53:7
	serve 36:24	sounds 113:15	Stang 4:14	suggested 39:15 88:4
	served 9:14 19:17	source 13:12 28:22 79:24 89:10,16,20 90:5,7 94:2 107:10	star 46:8	suggests 52:24 53:15
	serves 16:2	sources 91:19 92:24	started 7:10 37:13	suing 31:12
	services 7:17,19 12:22 14:7 16:4 43:4, 5 87:17	Southern 6:16	state 4:9 61:25 62:3, 20 113:20	summarize 107:4
	set 47:18 94:3 100:3 107:18	speak 46:4 47:10 48:8 66:13 67:24 84:2,8 105:18	stated 65:21 68:7 77:14	summarizing 48:18
	sets 24:23	speaking 34:21 35:3	statement 63:3,12 64:13 70:4 79:25 80:4,6	Supplemental 72:20
	share 81:20		statements 58:25 69:24 72:6,12,16,20, 25 74:7,12 75:2,8,21, 25 76:11,20,24 77:23 78:15,19 79:7,12	support 54:2
	shared 43:5		states 6:6 24:7 27:8 40:13 53:10 65:8 81:24	supposed 74:15 99:15
	she'll 84:23		stating 55:8 70:7	Surgent 37:10 80:16, 17,24 81:3
	sheet 41:17 69:8		staying 10:17	surmising 35:4,5
	sheets 41:12		stick 68:6 102:22	surrounding 50:3 118:22
	shortest 49:4		stop 84:24 103:5	suspect 20:24
	shortly 82:10		strategic 109:13	sworn 4:4 63:2 120:21
	show 32:9 49:17 92:2		strike 88:21	system 40:24
	showed 38:12		subject 108:25	T
	shown 76:5			T-E-R-R-A-S-T-A-R 16:10
	shows 91:14			
	shuffle 10:16			
	sic 16:10 46:8			
	sign 24:15 53:8,16 54:7,11,16 116:10			
save 120:2				
schedules 68:21,24 69:9,25				
school 6:12,15,19,21				
scope 76:15				
Scott 9:18				
screen 23:15,18 31:16 82:16 111:20				

taking 66:24 67:2	91:6 92:8,17,19	treated 70:12,18,22	view 43:7 108:15 116:19 117:19	work 7:6 8:11 12:13 13:2,10 96:15 98:23 101:21 110:14
talk 16:7,11 39:15 48:5 67:14	96:10,19 100:7,20 105:22 106:7 108:11 117:16 119:22 120:13,15	trial 77:5 98:15 102:13,25 103:2 120:2	vis-à-vis 65:15 95:7	worked 7:7 8:14 9:17 26:15,16 27:17 37:12
talked 35:9 67:13		Trust 14:13 109:8	void 115:9	working 111:10
talking 11:21 25:15 63:16	times 48:8		<hr/> W <hr/>	works 11:11 117:21
tax 6:23	timing 32:15 74:3 108:19	<hr/> U <hr/>	wait 14:18 101:4	world 56:9 65:8
team 19:25 21:14 22:4,12 77:13	title 9:25 12:10 15:13, 17,20 18:10,14	ultimately 79:19 80:13 81:12	waiting 113:6	write 61:6,7 116:8
telling 56:9 57:4	titles 14:9 17:17	unaware 39:21 50:13 97:5	watch 11:20	writing 81:23
tells 88:16	today 4:19 6:19 9:23 10:7 12:8,11,18 18:20 32:19 35:20 36:16 41:7 71:24 78:22 98:17 101:12 108:11 119:22	unclear 93:14	Waterhouse 17:10, 13,16 18:4,11,14,19 19:3,6,17 20:2 25:6 29:24 39:16 43:24 46:4 47:7 48:2,6,15, 19 49:6,17 50:9,16, 21,24 51:10,17,21,24 52:6,24 53:8,10,15, 25 54:7,18,24 55:4,7, 11 56:9,17 58:9,13 59:2,10,14 60:13,18 61:8,16 63:22 70:17, 21 71:19 78:16 80:16,22 81:7,10,17 90:4 104:21 105:19, 22 106:5 116:9 117:4,15,25 118:11, 17 119:7,9	written 44:25 65:6 82:12
ten 8:4 49:13 66:9 67:5	told 11:10 32:23 38:6 50:12 53:18,19 54:18,21 56:4,12,17 58:8 71:17,19 81:17 89:22,24 90:3 94:16 98:9 100:16 102:20 104:7 105:5 108:4,9 112:24 115:19 116:6	uncovered 86:17	Waterhouse's 28:8, 10 29:20,22 118:3	wrong 73:7
tenure 8:15		understand 5:18 20:6 23:19 25:10 26:12 30:2 35:22 73:20 74:2 75:24 83:11 91:13,18,22,23 93:9,22 96:23 97:20 98:5 101:14 102:6 103:15		wrote 27:18 50:20 60:12
term 13:5 22:5 30:12 118:25	top 28:14 92:24	understanding 15:20 16:16 18:22 19:2,24 21:15,19,21 22:3,8 31:10 71:10, 12 74:10,14 84:17 87:9 92:23 95:9 117:3	<hr/> Y <hr/>	year 9:4 96:25
terminated 23:7	topic 52:16	understood 50:23	year 9:4 96:25	years 8:4 15:12 59:19
Terrestar 16:8,12,17 19:12 22:10,17 45:11,16 50:7 57:12, 14,17 65:9,22 87:8	total 14:22 91:15 92:25 93:10,13,15, 17,22	undertook 98:6	<hr/> Z <hr/>	
testified 4:5 56:4 58:19 98:16	transaction 61:13 62:6,24 63:15 84:5 108:20 117:2 119:8	University 6:16	week 36:21,25	Ziehl 4:14
testifying 98:17	transactional 8:10	utilized 87:21	weeks 78:23 106:10	
testimony 45:23 55:17 56:16 64:4 67:25 68:4	transcript 55:15 120:9	utilizes 87:16	weighted 86:5	
Texas 6:8	transfer 71:20 89:22, 24 108:6 115:3	<hr/> V <hr/>	Weinstein 7:8,9	
thereof 48:23,25	transferred 27:5 56:22 58:20,22 61:23 64:2 94:14 115:24	vague 17:21	wholly 7:20 13:7	
thing 25:15 84:6	transferring 117:12	valid 76:10	Wick 7:10,11,16 8:15	
things 9:17 34:2 35:9 47:25 62:20 102:8,19 113:20	transpired 100:7 114:25	valuation 19:25 21:14 22:4,12 57:12, 14,17 80:10 81:11 82:8 85:12 86:5 87:4, 7,17 88:5,8	Winstead 6:22	
Thomas 37:10 80:16	treasurer 18:7,25 19:3 21:13,16	verify 28:12 29:21	withdrawn 7:15 15:25 31:17 47:15 57:9 59:5 61:6 62:2 65:6 70:16 80:23,25 89:14 92:10 104:2 112:12 114:18 117:25	
thought 46:7		vice 35:24,25 36:4	word 28:13	
till 6:23 120:2			words 52:22 54:9	
time 5:22 6:18,24 7:25 9:14 12:14 13:11 17:22 18:5,15 23:16 31:20,21 33:25 38:12 41:20 42:3,16 49:6 50:23,25 51:12, 16,18 66:8 68:9,25 75:3 78:21 84:21				

EXHIBIT 194

Kristin Hendrix - October 27, 2021

1	<p>1 IN THE UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT</p> <p>2 FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS</p> <p>3 DALLAS DIVISION</p> <p>4 --oOo--</p> <p>5</p> <p>6 HIGHLAND CAPITAL MANAGEMENT,)</p> <p>7 L.P.,)</p> <p>8)</p> <p>9 Plaintiff,)</p> <p>10)</p> <p>11 vs.) No. 21-03004-sgj</p> <p>12)</p> <p>13 HIGHLAND CAPITAL MANAGEMENT FUND)</p> <p>14 ADVISORS, L.P.,)</p> <p>15)</p> <p>16 Defendants.)</p> <p>17</p> <p>18 DEPOSITION OF</p> <p>19 KRISTIN HENDRIX</p> <p>20 October 27, 2021</p> <p>21</p> <p>22 DEPOSITION OF KRISTIN HENDRIX, produced as a</p> <p>23 witness, duly sworn by me via videoconference at the</p> <p>24 instance of the DEFENDANTS, was taken in the</p> <p>25 above-styled and numbered cause on October 27, 2021,</p> <p>from 10:11 A.M. to 1:19 P.M., before BRANDON D. COMBS,</p> <p>CSR, RPR, in and for the State of Texas, reported by</p> <p>computerized machine shorthand, at 500 North Akard</p> <p>Street, 38th Floor, Dallas, Texas.</p>	3
2	<p>1 APPEARANCES</p> <p>2</p> <p>3 MUNSCH, HARDT, KOPF & HARR, PC, 500 North</p> <p>4 Akard Street, Suite 3800, Dallas, TX 75201, represented</p> <p>5 by DAVOR RUKAVINA, Attorney at Law, appeared as counsel</p> <p>6 on behalf of the Defendants.</p> <p>7 Email: drukavina@munsch.com</p> <p>8</p> <p>9</p> <p>10 PACHULSKI, STANG, ZIEHL & JONES, 780 Third</p> <p>11 Avenue, 34th Floor, New York, NY 10017-2024, represented</p> <p>12 by JOHN A. MORRIS, Attorney at Law, appeared as counsel</p> <p>13 on behalf of the Plaintiff.</p> <p>14 Email: jmorris@pszjlaw.com</p> <p>15</p> <p>16</p> <p>17 STINSON, LLP, 3102 Oak Lawn Avenue, Suite 777,</p> <p>18 Dallas, TX 75219, represented by MICHAEL AIGEN, Attorney</p> <p>19 at Law, appeared via videoconference as counsel on</p> <p>20 behalf of the Defendants Jim Dondero, HCMS and HCRE</p> <p>21 Partners.</p> <p>22 Email: michael.aigen@stinson.com</p> <p>23</p> <p>24</p> <p>25</p>	4
3	<p>1 INDEX</p> <p>2</p> <p>3 Examination by MR. RUKAVINA 6</p> <p>4 Examination by MR. AIGEN 94</p> <p>5 Further Examination by MR. RUKAVINA 110</p> <p>6 Examination by MR. MORRIS 111</p> <p>7</p> <p>8 EXHIBITS</p> <p>9</p> <p>10 Exhibit 1 Promissory Note, 5M, May 3 30</p> <p>11</p> <p>12 Exhibit 2 Promissory Note, 2.4M, May 2 30</p> <p>13</p> <p>14 Exhibit 3 Email from David Klos, May 2, 2019, 31</p> <p>15 HCMLP to HCMFA loan</p> <p>16</p> <p>17 Exhibit 4 Promissory Note, 5M, May 3 42</p> <p>18</p> <p>19 Exhibit 5 Promissory Note, 2.4M, May 2 42</p> <p>20</p> <p>21 Exhibit 6 Promissory Note, 5M, May 3 43</p> <p>22</p> <p>23 Exhibit 7 Promissory Note, 2.4M, May 2 43</p> <p>24</p> <p>25 Exhibit 8 Info, HCMF loan 05.03.2019 56</p>	3
4	<p>1 Exhibit 9 Info, HCMF loan 05.02.2019 56</p> <p>2</p> <p>3 Exhibit 10 Email from Scott Ellington, Dec 2, 59</p> <p>4 2020, HCM - HCMFA financial</p> <p>5 statements</p> <p>6</p> <p>7 Exhibit 11 Email from John Morris to 62</p> <p>8 James Seery, Jan 6, 2021,</p> <p>9 HCM information request</p> <p>10</p> <p>11 Exhibit 12 Letter, Dec 3, 2020, Demand on 65</p> <p>12 Promissory Notes</p> <p>13</p> <p>14 Exhibit 13 Promissory Note, \$30,746,812.33, 72</p> <p>15 May 31</p> <p>16</p> <p>17 Exhibit 14 NPA \$30.7M 76</p> <p>18</p> <p>19 Exhibit 15 HCMLP Notes Receivable 83</p> <p>20</p> <p>21 Exhibit 16 Email from Frank Waterhouse to 85</p> <p>22 Lauren Thedford, Oct 6, 2020, 15(c)</p> <p>23 follow-up</p> <p>24</p> <p>25</p>	4

Kristin Hendrix - October 27, 2021

<p style="text-align: right;">5</p> <p>1 Exhibit 17 Email from James Seery to 88</p> <p>2 James Dondero, Jan 7, 2021, demand</p> <p>3 on promissory note</p> <p>4</p> <p>5 Exhibit 18 Email from Kristin Hendrix, Jan 12, 90</p> <p>6 2021, NexPoint Note to HCMLP</p> <p>7</p> <p>8</p> <p>9</p> <p>10</p> <p>11</p> <p>12</p> <p>13</p> <p>14</p> <p>15</p> <p>16</p> <p>17</p> <p>18</p> <p>19</p> <p>20</p> <p>21</p> <p>22</p> <p>23</p> <p>24</p> <p>25</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">7</p> <p>1 understood my question; okay?</p> <p>2 A. Yeah.</p> <p>3 MR. MORRIS: Objection.</p> <p>4 Q. (BY MR. RUKAVINA) Sometimes Counsel will</p> <p>5 make objections. Unless he instructs you not to</p> <p>6 answer, you're still required to answer my questions.</p> <p>7 A. Okay.</p> <p>8 Q. Now, in preparation for this deposition, did</p> <p>9 you read the deposition transcript or any part of it of</p> <p>10 Frank Waterhouse?</p> <p>11 A. I did not.</p> <p>12 Q. Did anyone provide you a synopsis or summary</p> <p>13 of it?</p> <p>14 A. Maybe a few bits and pieces, but...</p> <p>15 MR. RUKAVINA: Off the record for a second.</p> <p>16 (Off the record.)</p> <p>17 Q. (BY MR. RUKAVINA) What do you mean bits and</p> <p>18 pieces?</p> <p>19 A. I don't recall anything specific that was</p> <p>20 said, other than it was very long.</p> <p>21 Q. Did you talk to Frank Waterhouse about it?</p> <p>22 A. Did not.</p> <p>23 Q. Other than Highland's legal counsel, did you</p> <p>24 talk to anyone else about -- or -- strike that.</p> <p>25 Other than Highland's legal counsel, did you</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">6</p> <p>1 KRISTIN HENDRIX,</p> <p>2 having been first duly sworn, testified as follows:</p> <p>3 EXAMINATION</p> <p>4 Q. (BY MR. RUKAVINA) Good morning. If you'll</p> <p>5 state your name.</p> <p>6 A. Kristin Hendrix.</p> <p>7 Q. We're doing this both ways. You're on the</p> <p>8 Zoom remotely and they can see you, but I would ask</p> <p>9 that you and I maintain eye contact. Of course, if</p> <p>10 someone is asking you on the Zoom, then maintain</p> <p>11 contact with them, if that's okay with you.</p> <p>12 A. Sure.</p> <p>13 Q. Have you been deposed before?</p> <p>14 A. No.</p> <p>15 Q. So I'm sure your counsel explained to you,</p> <p>16 but very quickly, you understand that you're testifying</p> <p>17 under oath and penalty of perjury as though you were in</p> <p>18 a court of law?</p> <p>19 A. Yes.</p> <p>20 Q. And you understand my job is to ask clear</p> <p>21 questions that you understand?</p> <p>22 A. Yes.</p> <p>23 Q. And if for whatever reason you don't</p> <p>24 understand my questions, please let me know or ask me</p> <p>25 to rephrase; otherwise, I'm going to assume that you</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">8</p> <p>1 talk to anyone about Frank Waterhouse's deposition from</p> <p>2 last week?</p> <p>3 A. I did not.</p> <p>4 Q. Did you review -- strike that.</p> <p>5 Did you see any of the video of</p> <p>6 Mr. Waterhouse's deposition?</p> <p>7 A. Nope.</p> <p>8 Q. Same questions now for Mr. Seery, S-e-e-r-y.</p> <p>9 Did you read any portion or the whole of</p> <p>10 Mr. Seery's deposition from last week?</p> <p>11 A. I did not.</p> <p>12 Q. See any of the video?</p> <p>13 A. No.</p> <p>14 Q. Did you see any synopsis or summary of his</p> <p>15 deposition?</p> <p>16 A. No.</p> <p>17 Q. Did you talk to him about his deposition?</p> <p>18 A. I did not.</p> <p>19 Q. Other than talking to Highland's counsel, did</p> <p>20 you talk to anyone about Mr. Seery's deposition?</p> <p>21 A. No.</p> <p>22 Q. Other than talking to Highland's counsel, did</p> <p>23 you talk to anyone about your deposition today?</p> <p>24 A. Just John Morris and Dave Klos.</p> <p>25 Q. When did you talk to Mr. Klos, K-l-o-s?</p>

Kristin Hendrix - October 27, 2021

<p style="text-align: right;">9</p> <p>1 A. First time about this was last Friday. And</p> <p>2 then again Monday this week. And yesterday. And this</p> <p>3 morning.</p> <p>4 Q. Friday was there any lawyer present during</p> <p>5 your discussion with Mr. Klos?</p> <p>6 A. Yes, every time Mr. Morris was present.</p> <p>7 MR. RUKAVINA: Is it your position that those</p> <p>8 four discussions would be privileged, Counsel?</p> <p>9 MR. MORRIS: Yes.</p> <p>10 MR. RUKAVINA: Then we'll move on.</p> <p>11 Q. (BY MR. RUKAVINA) So we've established the</p> <p>12 four times you talked to Mr. Klos with counsel present.</p> <p>13 Did you do anything else related to or in preparation</p> <p>14 for today's deposition?</p> <p>15 A. Yes, probably went through and reviewed some</p> <p>16 emails, documentation that I may have had that I need</p> <p>17 to refresh memory on.</p> <p>18 Q. These documents and emails that you might</p> <p>19 have reviewed, did you supplementally provide them to</p> <p>20 counsel or anyone else?</p> <p>21 A. Yes.</p> <p>22 Q. This would have been in the last week or</p> <p>23 10 days?</p> <p>24 A. Yes.</p> <p>25 Q. Prior to the last week or 10 days, are you</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">11</p> <p>1 A. Yes.</p> <p>2 Q. And has your CPA license been current since</p> <p>3 then?</p> <p>4 A. Sure has.</p> <p>5 Q. Have you faced any kind of disciplinary</p> <p>6 action as a CPA?</p> <p>7 A. I have not.</p> <p>8 Q. Now, please walk me through your work</p> <p>9 history. Let's say starting with after you graduated</p> <p>10 college.</p> <p>11 A. Sure. December of 2005, which was shortly --</p> <p>12 sorry, 2004, shortly after I graduated from</p> <p>13 North Texas, I started at Highland. It was my first</p> <p>14 real job out of college. I have been there ever since,</p> <p>15 almost 17 years now.</p> <p>16 Have worked in the corporate accounting</p> <p>17 department the entire time. Started off as the AP</p> <p>18 associate, and worked my way up over the years and</p> <p>19 currently am the controller.</p> <p>20 Q. So even when you were getting your MBA and</p> <p>21 CPA you were employed by Highland?</p> <p>22 A. Yes.</p> <p>23 Q. Impressive. You're the controller today you</p> <p>24 mentioned?</p> <p>25 A. Yes.</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">10</p> <p>1 aware that my office served requests for production on</p> <p>2 Highland?</p> <p>3 A. Yes.</p> <p>4 Q. And did you do anything prior to the last</p> <p>5 week or 10 days to try to search both your personal</p> <p>6 records and corporate records for any responsive</p> <p>7 documents?</p> <p>8 A. Not that I recall.</p> <p>9 Q. Is that something that you understand legal</p> <p>10 counsel was charged with?</p> <p>11 A. Yes.</p> <p>12 Q. Let's go briefly now about your background,</p> <p>13 please.</p> <p>14 Where do you live?</p> <p>15 A. I live in Denton, Texas.</p> <p>16 Q. And what is your date of birth, please?</p> <p>17 A. January 26, 1982.</p> <p>18 Q. And walk me through your educational</p> <p>19 background, starting with any postsecondary, if any,</p> <p>20 schooling or college or anything like that.</p> <p>21 A. Sure. Graduated in 2004 from the University</p> <p>22 of North Texas with a degree in finance. Went on to</p> <p>23 get my MBA from SMU in 2009. And then went further and</p> <p>24 got my CPA license I believe in 2015.</p> <p>25 Q. In the state of Texas?</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">12</p> <p>1 Q. That's -- when did you become the controller,</p> <p>2 sometime February or March of this year?</p> <p>3 A. Yes.</p> <p>4 Q. Before you became the controller, what was</p> <p>5 your role at Highland?</p> <p>6 A. Right before that I was assistant controller.</p> <p>7 That was I believe April of 2020. Before that, the</p> <p>8 senior accounting manager, and I held that position for</p> <p>9 years.</p> <p>10 Q. So in May of 2019 would you have been the</p> <p>11 senior -- you said senior account?</p> <p>12 A. Senior accounting manager I believe was my</p> <p>13 title.</p> <p>14 Q. And would that have been your title in May of</p> <p>15 2017?</p> <p>16 A. Yes, I believe so.</p> <p>17 Q. And let's focus now on May 2019 as the senior</p> <p>18 accounting manager. How would you describe your role</p> <p>19 at Highland in May of 2019? What were your duties?</p> <p>20 A. Sure. I helped with treasury management</p> <p>21 function, cash forecasts and things like that. And</p> <p>22 oversaw the financial reporting from the last batch of</p> <p>23 AP to all the way to financials and reporting on</p> <p>24 audits.</p> <p>25 Q. Who did you report to in May of 2019?</p>

Kristin Hendrix - October 27, 2021

<p style="text-align: right;">13</p> <p>1 A. David Klos.</p> <p>2 Q. What was Mr. Klos' title to your</p> <p>3 understanding back then?</p> <p>4 A. I believe he was the controller.</p> <p>5 Q. And do you have an understanding as to who</p> <p>6 Mr. Klos reported to back then?</p> <p>7 A. Yes, Frank Waterhouse.</p> <p>8 Q. Frank Waterhouse. Who was he in May of 2019?</p> <p>9 A. The CFO.</p> <p>10 Q. Is Mr. Klos still with Highland today?</p> <p>11 A. He is.</p> <p>12 Q. What is his role now?</p> <p>13 A. He's now CFO.</p> <p>14 Q. You mentioned treasury management as of 2019,</p> <p>15 May. What do you mean by treasury management? What is</p> <p>16 that?</p> <p>17 A. Generally speaking, we -- it's not just me as</p> <p>18 one person. We have checks and balances.</p> <p>19 My team would be in charge of sending out</p> <p>20 payments, reconciling bank statements, making sure</p> <p>21 money is in the right accounts, creating cash forecasts</p> <p>22 and reporting on those every week with the CFO and</p> <p>23 oftentimes the CEO.</p> <p>24 Generally that's everything that fell under</p> <p>25 the umbrella.</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">15</p> <p>1 A. Yes, you can say the debtor.</p> <p>2 Q. So when I say the debtor and you say the</p> <p>3 debtor we understand each other to mean Highland</p> <p>4 Capital Management, comma, LP; correct?</p> <p>5 A. Correct.</p> <p>6 Q. I apologize. In the December 2020 period, I</p> <p>7 would imagine that the debtor had its own -- that</p> <p>8 was -- strike that.</p> <p>9 We'll cut to the chase.</p> <p>10 In December of 2020, the debtor was providing</p> <p>11 services to various other entities affiliated with</p> <p>12 Mr. Dondero; correct?</p> <p>13 A. Correct.</p> <p>14 Q. That would have included NexPoint Advisors,</p> <p>15 LP?</p> <p>16 A. Correct.</p> <p>17 Q. And you're aware that NexPoint Advisors was</p> <p>18 the obligor on at least one promissory note to the</p> <p>19 debtor; correct?</p> <p>20 A. Correct.</p> <p>21 Q. And did the debtor in December 2020 provide</p> <p>22 so-called treasury management services to NexPoint</p> <p>23 Advisors?</p> <p>24 MR. MORRIS: Objection to the form of the</p> <p>25 question.</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">14</p> <p>1 Q. And would your description of treasury</p> <p>2 management be the same for the December 2020 period?</p> <p>3 A. Yes.</p> <p>4 Q. Who at Highland or which group at Highland in</p> <p>5 December of 2020 would have been responsible for noting</p> <p>6 that there are certain bills that need to be paid in</p> <p>7 the near or subsequent future.</p> <p>8 By way of, let's say, accounts payable or</p> <p>9 promissory notes or taxes or anything like that?</p> <p>10 A. Can you repeat your question.</p> <p>11 Q. Sure. So obviously, Highland was a pretty</p> <p>12 sophisticated business; correct?</p> <p>13 A. Yeah.</p> <p>14 MR. MORRIS: Objection to the form.</p> <p>15 Q. (BY MR. RUKAVINA) And had various accounts</p> <p>16 payable; right?</p> <p>17 A. Yes.</p> <p>18 Q. And it had maybe, let's just say, certain</p> <p>19 note obligations that it had to pay from time to time;</p> <p>20 correct?</p> <p>21 MR. MORRIS: Objection to the form of the</p> <p>22 question. Do you mean Highland Capital?</p> <p>23 MR. RUKAVINA: I mean Highland Capital</p> <p>24 Management; correct, I'm sorry. The debtor.</p> <p>25 Q. (BY MR. RUKAVINA) Can we say the debtor?</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">16</p> <p>1 THE WITNESS: Yes.</p> <p>2 Q. (BY MR. RUKAVINA) As part of that, in</p> <p>3 December 2020, would it have been employees of the</p> <p>4 debtor that would have scheduled for potential payment,</p> <p>5 subject to approval by NexPoint, NexPoint's future</p> <p>6 obligations as they were coming due?</p> <p>7 A. Yes, we would have scheduled, only with</p> <p>8 approval.</p> <p>9 Q. And would that have included NexPoint's</p> <p>10 obligations on the promissory note to Highland?</p> <p>11 A. Yes.</p> <p>12 Q. Back to your background briefly.</p> <p>13 Do you have any legal training at all?</p> <p>14 A. I do not.</p> <p>15 Q. Do you have any courses, have you taken any</p> <p>16 courses in drafting promissory notes?</p> <p>17 A. No.</p> <p>18 Q. Do you believe that your expertise as a</p> <p>19 certified public accountant gives you any greater</p> <p>20 qualification than anyone else to prepare a promissory</p> <p>21 note?</p> <p>22 MR. MORRIS: Objection to the form of the</p> <p>23 question.</p> <p>24 THE WITNESS: No.</p> <p>25 Q. (BY MR. RUKAVINA) Have you ever prepared or</p>

Kristin Hendrix - October 27, 2021

<p style="text-align: right;">17</p> <p>1 drafted a promissory note?</p> <p>2 A. That term is probably used loosely. I have</p> <p>3 not completely drafted a promissory note from scratch,</p> <p>4 no.</p> <p>5 Q. And we'll go into the details. Fair to say</p> <p>6 that you have taken a form promissory note and revised</p> <p>7 it?</p> <p>8 A. Absolutely.</p> <p>9 Q. Was this part of your job in May of 2019 at</p> <p>10 Highland?</p> <p>11 A. Yes.</p> <p>12 Q. Going back to the May 2019 time frame, were</p> <p>13 you part of a particular group at Highland, like</p> <p>14 accounting or legal or compliance?</p> <p>15 A. Yes, corporate accounting.</p> <p>16 Q. Corporate accounting. That's what you</p> <p>17 described before about treasury management and</p> <p>18 projections and forecasts?</p> <p>19 A. Yes.</p> <p>20 Q. In May of 2019, was it the practice at</p> <p>21 Highland that corporate accounting would be responsible</p> <p>22 for drafting intercompany promissory notes?</p> <p>23 A. Not necessarily drafting, but updating a</p> <p>24 draft that had been previously produced and provided by</p> <p>25 our legal team, yes.</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">19</p> <p>1 Q. By updating, what do you mean?</p> <p>2 A. There's a few things that would need</p> <p>3 updating, the date.</p> <p>4 Q. Maker?</p> <p>5 A. Maker.</p> <p>6 Q. Amount?</p> <p>7 A. The dollar amount, the interest rate.</p> <p>8 Q. And is it your testimony that the corporate</p> <p>9 accounting group would do these things on its own</p> <p>10 without necessarily the involvement of the legal group?</p> <p>11 MR. MORRIS: Objection to the form of the</p> <p>12 question.</p> <p>13 THE WITNESS: Generally, yes.</p> <p>14 Q. (BY MR. RUKAVINA) Do you have any memory in</p> <p>15 or before May of 2019 if the corporate -- I'm sorry, if</p> <p>16 the legal group became involved in drafting or</p> <p>17 executing any prior intercompany promissory notes?</p> <p>18 A. Yes.</p> <p>19 Q. Explain to me what you remember about that.</p> <p>20 A. I do know that they were involved with</p> <p>21 drafting restructured notes. So taking demand notes</p> <p>22 and turning them into a 30-year amort note.</p> <p>23 That was in 2017. I know for sure that they</p> <p>24 were involved in that because it was something</p> <p>25 different. We weren't just updating a demand note.</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">18</p> <p>1 Q. And Highland in May -- the debtor in May of</p> <p>2 2019 did have a legal department?</p> <p>3 A. Yes.</p> <p>4 Q. Kind of like the corporate accounting, there</p> <p>5 was a separate legal department; correct?</p> <p>6 A. Correct.</p> <p>7 Q. And who would have been in charge of that</p> <p>8 department in May of 2019?</p> <p>9 A. Scott Ellington, E-I-I-n-g-t-o-n.</p> <p>10 Q. In May of 2019 or by May of 2019 was there</p> <p>11 any practice at Highland as to whether its legal</p> <p>12 department would be involved with the drafting or</p> <p>13 execution of any intercompany promissory notes?</p> <p>14 MR. MORRIS: Objection to the form of the</p> <p>15 question.</p> <p>16 THE WITNESS: It depends on the note.</p> <p>17 Q. (BY MR. RUKAVINA) What did it depend on?</p> <p>18 A. Our typical practice is if we have a loan</p> <p>19 with certain affiliates that it's a demand note. We</p> <p>20 have a template that we have used for years that was</p> <p>21 created by either our internal legal team or an outside</p> <p>22 law firm, I'm not sure which.</p> <p>23 The typical practice is always updating a few</p> <p>24 things on that template, getting it executed, and</p> <p>25 filing it in our audit folders.</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">20</p> <p>1 Q. Is it your testimony that to the best of your</p> <p>2 recollection by May of 2019 and in May of 2019 it would</p> <p>3 have been the corporate accounting group that would</p> <p>4 have handled routine intercompany demand notes?</p> <p>5 A. Yes.</p> <p>6 Q. And you can think of more than one instance</p> <p>7 on which that happened?</p> <p>8 A. Yes.</p> <p>9 Q. And this is not a memory test, but going back</p> <p>10 in time can you try to give an estimate of what year</p> <p>11 that first started happening, that the corporate</p> <p>12 accounting would handle the drafting or execution of</p> <p>13 intercompany demand notes?</p> <p>14 A. As far as I can remember.</p> <p>15 Q. Is it your testimony that as -- maybe even</p> <p>16 going back as far as 2005 there were intercompany</p> <p>17 demand notes?</p> <p>18 A. Yes.</p> <p>19 Q. I don't know how to ask this question, but</p> <p>20 was this a significant thing in corporate accounting or</p> <p>21 just another routine deal when you handled demand</p> <p>22 notes?</p> <p>23 MR. MORRIS: Objection to the form of the</p> <p>24 question.</p> <p>25 THE WITNESS: This is a routine job duty that</p>

Kristin Hendrix - October 27, 2021

<p style="text-align: right;">21</p> <p>1 we routinely did.</p> <p>2 Q. (BY MR. RUKAVINA) Between 2005 and 2019, do</p> <p>3 you remember any maker on these intercompany demand</p> <p>4 notes actually being required to pay a demand note, in</p> <p>5 other words, Highland making demand?</p> <p>6 A. Not that I can specifically recall.</p> <p>7 Q. Do you have any recollection as to what</p> <p>8 happened to these intercompany demand notes over the</p> <p>9 years between 2005 and 2019?</p> <p>10 A. Yeah. Typically anytime specifically Jim</p> <p>11 Dondero would need to move money between related</p> <p>12 parties, he would pay down -- when I say him, he would</p> <p>13 have us in corporate accounting move money around, pay</p> <p>14 off notes, reissue new notes somewhere else.</p> <p>15 So a way to move money around between his</p> <p>16 entities.</p> <p>17 Q. So let's use just hypotheticals here so that</p> <p>18 I'm not trying to pin you down to any specific fact.</p> <p>19 But between 2005 and 2019, is it fair to say</p> <p>20 that if some Dondero entity that's not the debtor</p> <p>21 needed money and the debtor had money, then Dondero</p> <p>22 would have the debtor lend money to that entity on a</p> <p>23 demand note basis?</p> <p>24 A. So long as they have the cash available to do</p> <p>25 so.</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">23</p> <p>1 A. If the debtor needed cash to lend to another</p> <p>2 entity.</p> <p>3 Q. I see. So again, it's all one big happy</p> <p>4 family, and whoever needed cash, the cash moved around;</p> <p>5 correct?</p> <p>6 A. Correct.</p> <p>7 Q. Was it Mr. Dondero that basically was the</p> <p>8 only deciding person in each instance that you're aware</p> <p>9 of in those 14 years as to when a note would be made or</p> <p>10 repaid?</p> <p>11 A. I can't answer specifically to that. Most of</p> <p>12 my direction came from our CFO at the time,</p> <p>13 Frank Waterhouse. So what conversations he would have</p> <p>14 with Jim Dondero, I can't answer to that. But I would</p> <p>15 suspect so, yes.</p> <p>16 Q. And in May of 2019 or by May of 2019, did you</p> <p>17 communicate personally, by email or telephone, in</p> <p>18 person, periodically with Jim Dondero?</p> <p>19 A. I can't say periodically, no.</p> <p>20 Q. Well, I'm not trying to put words in your</p> <p>21 mouth. Is it fair to say that you kind of -- your</p> <p>22 communications stopped with Mr. Waterhouse and</p> <p>23 Waterhouse communicated with Dondero, as opposed to you</p> <p>24 regularly communicating with Dondero?</p> <p>25 A. That's typical, yes.</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">22</p> <p>1 Q. "They" being the debtor?</p> <p>2 A. Debtor, yes.</p> <p>3 Q. And is it fair to say, then, again</p> <p>4 hypothetically without any specifics, that if the</p> <p>5 debtor maybe from time to time needed money and one of</p> <p>6 these other entities had cash, then Dondero would cause</p> <p>7 that other entity to pay down the demand note?</p> <p>8 MR. MORRIS: Objection to the form of the</p> <p>9 question.</p> <p>10 THE WITNESS: Can you repeat that.</p> <p>11 Q. (BY MR. RUKAVINA) Sure. So I think you</p> <p>12 mentioned that from time to time these entities would</p> <p>13 pay down these demand notes?</p> <p>14 A. To the debtor?</p> <p>15 Q. To the debtor.</p> <p>16 A. Yes.</p> <p>17 Q. And is that, hypothetically again, is that</p> <p>18 because on occasion the debtor might have needed cash</p> <p>19 and these entities had the cash, so Dondero would have</p> <p>20 them pay back the note?</p> <p>21 MR. MORRIS: Objection to the form of the</p> <p>22 question.</p> <p>23 THE WITNESS: Yes, that could be a reason.</p> <p>24 Q. (BY MR. RUKAVINA) Can you think of any other</p> <p>25 reason in those 14 years?</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">24</p> <p>1 Q. Can you think of any instances in which</p> <p>2 Mr. Dondero gave you any instructions or you came to</p> <p>3 him seeking any instructions, without some intermediary</p> <p>4 between the two of you?</p> <p>5 A. No, usually Frank was present.</p> <p>6 Q. Would you categorize Mr. Waterhouse as kind</p> <p>7 of guarding with jealousy his access to Mr. Dondero?</p> <p>8 MR. MORRIS: Objection to the form of the</p> <p>9 question.</p> <p>10 THE WITNESS: No.</p> <p>11 Q. (BY MR. RUKAVINA) What kind of boss was he</p> <p>12 in May of 2019? Was he laid back, or was he a jerk?</p> <p>13 Was he demanding? How would you characterize him in</p> <p>14 May of 2019?</p> <p>15 MR. MORRIS: Objection to the form of the</p> <p>16 question.</p> <p>17 THE WITNESS: I would say he was a good boss.</p> <p>18 Q. (BY MR. RUKAVINA) You think he was competent</p> <p>19 as far as his job went?</p> <p>20 A. Yes, very competent.</p> <p>21 Q. Do you think he was competent as far as his</p> <p>22 job went in December of 2020?</p> <p>23 A. Yes.</p> <p>24 Q. January 2021?</p> <p>25 A. Yes.</p>

Kristin Hendrix - October 27, 2021

<p style="text-align: right;">25</p> <p>1 Q. Was he patient and understanding as a boss?</p> <p>2 A. Yes.</p> <p>3 Q. Okay. Was he ever condescending or rude to</p> <p>4 anyone in your presence?</p> <p>5 A. No.</p> <p>6 Q. So you're the controller today at Highland,</p> <p>7 the debtor, the reorganized debtor; right?</p> <p>8 A. Yes.</p> <p>9 Q. And who do you report to? You mentioned</p> <p>10 Mr. Klos is the CFO?</p> <p>11 A. Yes.</p> <p>12 Q. And do you also report to Mr. Seery?</p> <p>13 A. Yes, I think everybody does.</p> <p>14 Q. And I don't need to know details, but I take</p> <p>15 it you're on a salary from reorganized Highland?</p> <p>16 A. Yes.</p> <p>17 Q. Is any part of your compensation merit or</p> <p>18 bonus based?</p> <p>19 A. It could potentially be.</p> <p>20 Q. Have you had any discussions with Mr. Seery</p> <p>21 or Mr. Klos about some sort of bonus compensation?</p> <p>22 A. Yes.</p> <p>23 Q. Has anything been agreed to?</p> <p>24 A. Yes.</p> <p>25 Q. And again, I don't need to know the exact</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">27</p> <p>1 A. Correct.</p> <p>2 Q. And how Highland, reorganized Highland</p> <p>3 collects these promissory notes is going to play no</p> <p>4 part in your base and bonus compensation to your</p> <p>5 understanding; is that correct?</p> <p>6 A. To my knowledge, yes.</p> <p>7 Q. So you have no direct or indirect stake in</p> <p>8 the outcome of these litigations?</p> <p>9 A. No.</p> <p>10 Q. And you understand that I represent HCMFA and</p> <p>11 NexPoint?</p> <p>12 A. Yes.</p> <p>13 Q. And these court reporters are not familiar</p> <p>14 with some of our terminology. NAP [verbatim], if we</p> <p>15 say that, that means NexPoint; right?</p> <p>16 A. Uh-huh.</p> <p>17 Q. You have to say yes or no.</p> <p>18 A. Yes, NPA, NexPoint.</p> <p>19 Q. NPA. And when we say NexPoint, you and I are</p> <p>20 meaning NexPoint Advisors, LP; right?</p> <p>21 A. Yes.</p> <p>22 Q. And when we say HCMFA, we're meaning Highland</p> <p>23 Capital Management Fund Advisors, LP, yes?</p> <p>24 A. Yes.</p> <p>25 Q. What is your understanding of the two</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">26</p> <p>1 numbers. What would your bonus compensation consist</p> <p>2 of? How would it be decided?</p> <p>3 A. It's actually -- was decided when I agreed to</p> <p>4 stay on the Highland team back in February 2021, so</p> <p>5 it's in my employment agreement.</p> <p>6 Q. So what's your bonus compensation?</p> <p>7 A. I'm not sure I understand what you're asking.</p> <p>8 Q. So is the bonus discretionary on the part of</p> <p>9 Highland?</p> <p>10 A. No, it's a set amount.</p> <p>11 Q. And what triggers it or governs the set</p> <p>12 amount?</p> <p>13 A. Just it gets paid out on a certain date of</p> <p>14 the year. It's very straightforward, set out in my</p> <p>15 employment agreement.</p> <p>16 Q. Is it irrespective of the performance of the</p> <p>17 reorganized debtor?</p> <p>18 A. Yes.</p> <p>19 Q. So why do you call it a bonus instead of base</p> <p>20 compensation?</p> <p>21 A. That's what it's called in my agreement.</p> <p>22 Q. So your base compensation and your bonus,</p> <p>23 it's your testimony, you're going to earn it</p> <p>24 irrespective of whether reorganized Highland does good</p> <p>25 or bad with respect to its profitability?</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">28</p> <p>1 lawsuits, the one against HCMFA and the one against</p> <p>2 NexPoint, that you're being deposed on today?</p> <p>3 MR. MORRIS: Objection to the form of the</p> <p>4 question.</p> <p>5 Q. (BY MR. RUKAVINA) Who is suing who and for</p> <p>6 what?</p> <p>7 A. I don't know all the details.</p> <p>8 Q. So we've established that you've discussed</p> <p>9 these lawsuits in the last week or a little bit more</p> <p>10 with legal counsel. I don't want to talk about that.</p> <p>11 Prior to these recent discussions, did you</p> <p>12 have any discussions with anyone at Highland about its</p> <p>13 lawsuits against HCMFA and NexPoint on promissory</p> <p>14 notes?</p> <p>15 A. Repeat that again.</p> <p>16 Q. Sure. So remember we're excluding the recent</p> <p>17 discussions in the last week or 10 days with counsel;</p> <p>18 right?</p> <p>19 A. Okay.</p> <p>20 Q. Are you aware that in January of 2021 the</p> <p>21 debtor sued NexPoint to collect on a promissory note?</p> <p>22 A. I'm aware that demand notices were sent.</p> <p>23 Q. So until recently you weren't aware that a</p> <p>24 lawsuit had been filed?</p> <p>25 A. There's a lot of lawsuits filed. I can't</p>

Kristin Hendrix - October 27, 2021

<p style="text-align: right;">29</p> <p>1 keep track of what is what or what we're talking about</p> <p>2 at certain times.</p> <p>3 Q. But you have no distinct memory of that?</p> <p>4 A. Correct.</p> <p>5 Q. And same question for the lawsuit that the</p> <p>6 debtor filed against HCMFA in January.</p> <p>7 Do you have any specific memory of that</p> <p>8 lawsuit having been filed?</p> <p>9 A. Not specifically.</p> <p>10 Q. You mentioned that you're aware that on or</p> <p>11 before January 2021, demand letters had been sent?</p> <p>12 A. Yes.</p> <p>13 Q. Did you play any role in either drafting</p> <p>14 those demand letters or the decision to send them?</p> <p>15 A. No.</p> <p>16 Q. So going back to my question about these</p> <p>17 lawsuits, do you have any memory of anyone asking</p> <p>18 you -- again, excluding the last week or two.</p> <p>19 Do you have any memory of anyone asking you</p> <p>20 to do anything with respect to either or both of these</p> <p>21 lawsuits?</p> <p>22 A. No.</p> <p>23 Q. You have no memory of Mr. Waterhouse,</p> <p>24 Mr. Klos, Mr. Surgent, or Mr. Seery asking for any</p> <p>25 background information or your input at all on these</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">31</p> <p>1 about either or both of these two promissory notes?</p> <p>2 A. Sure, yes.</p> <p>3 Q. What do you remember?</p> <p>4 A. I remember seeing them because I've recently</p> <p>5 looked at them. I see them all the time in our loan</p> <p>6 tracking spreadsheets. My team would have been</p> <p>7 responsible for the whole process that I explained</p> <p>8 before when it comes to a promissory note.</p> <p>9 Q. And --</p> <p>10 MR. MORRIS: Are you finished?</p> <p>11 THE WITNESS: Yes.</p> <p>12 Q. (BY MR. RUKAVINA) And we have an email here</p> <p>13 that might give some more context to that if I can find</p> <p>14 it here.</p> <p>15 This will be Exhibit 3. This is an email</p> <p>16 from David Klos to corporate accounting dated May 2,</p> <p>17 2019.</p> <p>18 (Whereupon, Exhibit 3 was marked for</p> <p>19 identification.)</p> <p>20 Q. (BY MR. RUKAVINA) Do you see this email,</p> <p>21 ma'am?</p> <p>22 A. Yes.</p> <p>23 Q. Okay. Corporate accounting, would that email</p> <p>24 group have included you?</p> <p>25 A. Yes.</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">30</p> <p>1 two lawsuits?</p> <p>2 MR. MORRIS: Better not have been --</p> <p>3 THE WITNESS: No.</p> <p>4 Q. (BY MR. RUKAVINA) Who did I say? Did I</p> <p>5 misspeak? Okay.</p> <p>6 Now we're going to have some exhibits here.</p> <p>7 And do you have the labels?</p> <p>8 Let's take a minute break off the record.</p> <p>9 (Off the record.)</p> <p>10 Q. (BY MR. RUKAVINA) Ms. Hendrix, I'm going to</p> <p>11 provide to you a promissory note in the original</p> <p>12 principal amount of \$5 million from HCMFA. This is the</p> <p>13 PDF version of this as filed with the Court for</p> <p>14 collection. It's going to be Exhibit 1.</p> <p>15 (Whereupon, Exhibit 1 was marked for</p> <p>16 identification.)</p> <p>17 Q. (BY MR. RUKAVINA) Before you look at</p> <p>18 Exhibit 1, I'm going to do the same thing for</p> <p>19 Exhibit 2, which is a promissory note from HCMFA for</p> <p>20 \$2.4 million, dated May 2, 2019.</p> <p>21 (Whereupon, Exhibit 2 was marked for</p> <p>22 identification.)</p> <p>23 Q. (BY MR. RUKAVINA) Again, Ms. Hendrix, these</p> <p>24 are the PDF versions of these notes as filed with the</p> <p>25 Court. Sitting here today, do you remember anything</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">32</p> <p>1 Q. And this email says, Kristin, can you or</p> <p>2 Hayley. Do you think that Kristin was you?</p> <p>3 A. I do.</p> <p>4 Q. Do you remember receiving this email?</p> <p>5 A. Not explicitly.</p> <p>6 Q. So it says Blair. Who would Blair be?</p> <p>7 A. Blair was our AP associate.</p> <p>8 Q. What is her last name?</p> <p>9 A. At this time it would have been Roeber,</p> <p>10 R-o-e-b-e-r.</p> <p>11 Q. Okay. And did it subsequently change?</p> <p>12 A. Yes, it's now Hillis, H-i-l-l-i-s.</p> <p>13 Q. Please send \$2.4 million from HCMFP to HCMFA.</p> <p>14 This is a new interco loan. Kristin, can you or Hayley</p> <p>15 please prep a note for execution. I'll have further</p> <p>16 instructions later today, but please process this</p> <p>17 payment as soon as possible.</p> <p>18 Did I read that correctly?</p> <p>19 A. Yes.</p> <p>20 Q. Do you have any memory of whether this email</p> <p>21 relates to Exhibit 2, the \$2.4 million promissory note?</p> <p>22 A. It seems like it does, same date, same</p> <p>23 amount.</p> <p>24 Q. Do you have any memory, or in reviewing your</p> <p>25 files did you see any similar email or document that</p>

Kristin Hendrix - October 27, 2021

<p style="text-align: right;">33</p> <p>1 would have related to Exhibit 1, the \$5 million 2 promissory note? 3 A. Yes. I believe there's another email for 4 that one. 5 Q. And do you believe that you provided that to 6 counsel? 7 A. Yes. 8 Q. Recently or some time ago? 9 A. Well, I don't think I provided it, so I'm not 10 sure when they got it. I know it has been provided. 11 Q. You know that it has? 12 A. Uh-huh. 13 Q. How do you know? 14 A. Because I've seen it. 15 Q. In the production that was produced to me? 16 A. Yes. 17 Q. And also from a David Klos? 18 A. This one, or on the -- when I say this one, 19 on the \$2.4 million or the 5-? 20 Q. On the \$5 million note. 21 A. I'm not sure. 22 Q. Okay. Let me make sure I understand you 23 correctly. 24 Sitting here today you believe that there is 25 another email referencing the \$5 million loan that has</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">35</p> <p>1 the door, is typically how this works. 2 Q. Is the answer generally the same for the 3 \$5 million note? 4 A. Yes. 5 Q. So is it fair to say that typically, 6 obviously not every time, but typically your corporate 7 accounting group when it would see intercompany 8 transfers in large amounts would believe that they were 9 loans? 10 MR. MORRIS: Objection to the form of the 11 question. 12 THE WITNESS: Typically they were loans. 13 There's not really another way to get money from one 14 entity to another. And if they were papered as a loan, 15 that means we were told to set it up that way. 16 Q. (BY MR. RUKAVINA) What do you mean papered 17 as a loan? Aren't you papering it as a loan when 18 someone makes the promissory note? 19 A. Yes, because we're told by somebody to do 20 that. 21 Q. And in this instance, Mr. Klos on Exhibit 3 22 told the group that this was a loan; right? 23 A. Correct. But he would have spoken with 24 Frank Waterhouse or Jim Dondero prior to that, before 25 telling anybody to do that.</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">34</p> <p>1 been produced to my office? 2 A. Yes. I believe so. 3 Q. Okay. And going off memory, did it kind of 4 say the same thing as this Exhibit 3 except that it 5 referenced \$5 million? 6 MR. MORRIS: Objection to the form of the 7 question. 8 THE WITNESS: Generally, should have said the 9 similar situation, yeah. 10 Q. (BY MR. RUKAVINA) So Mr. Klos says, this is 11 a new interco loan, for Exhibit 3. Other than what he 12 told you, that this is an intercompany loan, did anyone 13 else tell you or did you have any other information on 14 May 2, 2019 that this was a loan? 15 A. I don't specifically recall these 16 conversations, but I can tell you our normal practice 17 would be we would either likely be in a cash meeting -- 18 and I say "we." Would have been myself, Dave Klos, 19 Frank Waterhouse, potentially even Jim Dondero. 20 But I don't recall conversations on this 21 specific date. But general practice is we would talk 22 about it. 23 Oftentimes, Frank would either call Dave or I 24 or stop by and tell us that, we need to send money to 25 an affiliate, paper up a new loan, let's get a wire out</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">36</p> <p>1 Q. Okay. And do you have any knowledge that he 2 did speak to Mr. Waterhouse or Mr. Dondero before 3 sending this email? 4 A. Again, I don't have specific knowledge on the 5 exact conversations, but that's always how it has 6 worked. 7 Q. That's how it was for 14 or 15 years; 8 correct? 9 A. Yes. 10 Q. But you're logically assuming that it 11 happened here. You don't know that it happened here; 12 correct? 13 MR. MORRIS: Objection to the form of the 14 question. 15 THE WITNESS: I would have to be fairly 16 certain that it did, even though I can't recall 17 specific conversations. 18 Q. (BY MR. RUKAVINA) Did you ask Mr. Klos about 19 who told him that this is a new intercompany loan on 20 Exhibit 3? 21 A. No. It's quite possible I was involved in 22 the conversation. I reported to him. I wouldn't 23 question his authority. 24 Q. Did you ask Mr. Klos who told him that the 25 \$5 million deal was also an intercompany loan?</p>

Kristin Hendrix - October 27, 2021

<p style="text-align: right;">37</p> <p>1 A. I did not ask that specific question that I 2 can recall.</p> <p>3 Q. Did you ask Mr. Waterhouse whether either of 4 these transactions were loans?</p> <p>5 A. I'm sure Mr. Waterhouse is the one that told 6 us they were loans. We wouldn't just paper up a loan, 7 send money out and call it a loan and account for it 8 that way, unless somebody specifically told us.</p> <p>9 Q. Do you have any memory of Mr. Waterhouse 10 orally or in writing or email or in any way, shape, or 11 form on or about May 2 or 3, 2019 telling you that the 12 2.4 million or \$5 million transfers were intercompany 13 loans?</p> <p>14 A. No specific knowledge of exact conversations, 15 but I'm certain that those conversations were had 16 because that's the only way that we would have papered 17 up a loan, sent money out as a loan, had them on our 18 financials for two years.</p> <p>19 Q. So you're saying that this email, Exhibit 3, 20 from Mr. Klos was not enough, that there would have 21 been other things that happened to make you and other 22 people in your group confident that these were loans?</p> <p>23 A. Yes.</p> <p>24 Q. And these other things would have been in 25 person or by email?</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">39</p> <p>1 a consent fee that the advisor of the Global Allocation 2 Fund had promised to pay to shareholders of that fund, 3 and it was in the amount of \$5 million roughly.</p> <p>4 So both of these loans were for those 5 purposes respectfully.</p> <p>6 Q. And were you in May of 2019 also aware that 7 in addition to the \$2.4 million, there was another more 8 than \$5 million paid to that fund by HCMFA's insurer as 9 compensation for the NAV error?</p> <p>10 A. By the insurance company, yes.</p> <p>11 Q. So the \$7.4 million, you understood then was 12 a loan as opposed to compensation to HCMFA?</p> <p>13 A. Yes.</p> <p>14 Q. Okay. Did you understand in May of 2019 that 15 it had been the debtor and its valuation team that 16 caused that NAV error?</p> <p>17 MR. MORRIS: Objection to the form of the 18 question.</p> <p>19 THE WITNESS: I can't answer that. I was not 20 involved with the activities leading up to the NAV 21 error.</p> <p>22 Q. (BY MR. RUKAVINA) How do you know that the 23 \$7.4 million were being transferred for the NAV error 24 and consent fee?</p> <p>25 A. Because I do know about both of those</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">38</p> <p>1 A. Most likely in person via phone call.</p> <p>2 Q. Okay. So again, you have no specific memory 3 of it, but based on the 14-year pattern and conduct you 4 believe that you would have discussed these two 5 transfers with Mr. Waterhouse and he would have told 6 you these are loans?</p> <p>7 MR. MORRIS: Objection to the form of the 8 question.</p> <p>9 THE WITNESS: Correct.</p> <p>10 Q. (BY MR. RUKAVINA) And then would he have 11 told you to take care of the promissory notes, or was 12 that Mr. Klos here in Exhibit 3?</p> <p>13 A. It could have been both. It's clearly Dave 14 in this email, but Frank could have also said that to 15 me.</p> <p>16 Q. Now, do you -- strike that.</p> <p>17 In May of 2019, did you know or were you told 18 why these \$7.4 million were being transferred from the 19 debtor to HCMFA?</p> <p>20 A. Yes. I do have recollection that -- I do 21 know that there were two big events in May 2019. 22 2.4 million was related to a TerreStar NAV error, with 23 one of the funds advised by HCMFA. That's Global 24 Allocation Fund.</p> <p>25 Similar with the \$5 million loan. There was</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">40</p> <p>1 instances and I do know that HCMFA needed to pay these 2 dollar amounts for both of those.</p> <p>3 Q. And you knew that in May of 2019?</p> <p>4 A. Yes.</p> <p>5 Q. How did you know that in May of 2019?</p> <p>6 A. It was lots of discussions had been going on 7 around both of these issues for months. These weren't 8 surprises to anybody.</p> <p>9 Q. So although you weren't involved directly 10 with the NAV error issues, it was more or less common 11 knowledge in your accounting group?</p> <p>12 A. Correct.</p> <p>13 Q. Do you have any knowledge at all as to 14 whether Mr. Dondero decided to transfer these 15 \$7.4 million not as a loan, but to compensate HCMFA for 16 the debtor's alleged liability?</p> <p>17 A. Have not heard of that.</p> <p>18 Q. Ever?</p> <p>19 A. Never.</p> <p>20 Q. But you also never heard Mr. Dondero say that 21 these \$7.4 million were a loan; correct?</p> <p>22 A. That was not told to me directly.</p> <p>23 Q. Again, you're logically assuming that based 24 on many instances of intercompany transfers in the 25 14 years prior to that?</p>

Kristin Hendrix - October 27, 2021

<p style="text-align: right;">41</p> <p>1 MR. MORRIS: Objection to the form of the</p> <p>2 question. Mischaracterizes the testimony.</p> <p>3 THE WITNESS: Correct.</p> <p>4 Q. (BY MR. RUKAVINA) I think you answered</p> <p>5 correct?</p> <p>6 A. Correct.</p> <p>7 Q. And you mentioned that after these notes, you</p> <p>8 saw them on internal financials and that reinforces</p> <p>9 your view that these were loans?</p> <p>10 A. Correct.</p> <p>11 Q. But as of May 2 and 3, 2019, no one had told</p> <p>12 you directly that these are loans?</p> <p>13 MR. MORRIS: Objection to the form of the</p> <p>14 question. It's in writing.</p> <p>15 THE WITNESS: That's not what I'm saying at</p> <p>16 all.</p> <p>17 Q. (BY MR. RUKAVINA) Other than Mr. Klos' email</p> <p>18 or emails, no one told you on May 2 or May 3, 2019 that</p> <p>19 you remember today that these were loans?</p> <p>20 A. It quite possibly could have been told to me</p> <p>21 in addition to this email.</p> <p>22 Q. I understand. You just have no memory of</p> <p>23 that today; correct?</p> <p>24 A. Correct.</p> <p>25 Q. Is there anything that you can think of</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">43</p> <p>1 answers don't count and I'm in trouble.</p> <p>2 6 will be the \$5 million note, and 7 will be</p> <p>3 the \$2.4 million note.</p> <p>4 (Whereupon, Exhibits 6 & 7 were marked for</p> <p>5 identification.)</p> <p>6 Q. (BY MR. RUKAVINA) Okay. So Exhibit 4 and 5</p> <p>7 are the Word documents. Do you have any memory of you</p> <p>8 doing anything with respect to these two Word</p> <p>9 documents?</p> <p>10 A. I don't have specific memory, but generally</p> <p>11 speaking, it was my job to update promissory note</p> <p>12 templates and create promissory notes.</p> <p>13 Q. So do you believe that -- we discussed</p> <p>14 earlier that your group would have used a template and</p> <p>15 that it would have made changes reflecting the maker,</p> <p>16 amount, date, interest rate.</p> <p>17 Do you believe you were the one with respect</p> <p>18 to 4 and 5 that updated that template to create 4</p> <p>19 and 5?</p> <p>20 A. I'm sure that I was, yes.</p> <p>21 Q. Well, Exhibit 6 -- do you know what metadata</p> <p>22 is?</p> <p>23 A. Sort of.</p> <p>24 Q. What's your understanding of what metadata</p> <p>25 is?</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">42</p> <p>1 sitting here today to refresh your memory on that</p> <p>2 point?</p> <p>3 A. I do not think so. I'm sure there was</p> <p>4 conversation that unfortunately would not be in an</p> <p>5 email.</p> <p>6 Q. Now, we have the Word documents, the Word</p> <p>7 version of these two promissory notes, and you're going</p> <p>8 to have rely on me that I printed these out as</p> <p>9 Mr. Morris sent to me. If I'm misleading you on that,</p> <p>10 then I'm in trouble and your answers don't count.</p> <p>11 So please assume that I didn't doctor these</p> <p>12 and that I printed them out as they were prepared to</p> <p>13 me; okay?</p> <p>14 A. Yes.</p> <p>15 Q. So Exhibit 4 will be the \$5 million note and</p> <p>16 Exhibit 5 will be the 2.4 million.</p> <p>17 (Whereupon, Exhibits 4 & 5 were marked for</p> <p>18 identification.)</p> <p>19 Q. (BY MR. RUKAVINA) Before I ask about 4 and</p> <p>20 5, to be fair to you and refresh your memory, I'm going</p> <p>21 to provide you printouts of the metadata, metadata --</p> <p>22 I'm not sure how to better say that -- for both notes.</p> <p>23 And again I'm representing to you that I</p> <p>24 printed out the metadata without doctoring it, so</p> <p>25 please assume that's true, and if it's not, your</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">44</p> <p>1 A. Just in context from speaking on it recently,</p> <p>2 it's going to tell you who made changes to the</p> <p>3 documents, is what I would assume.</p> <p>4 MR. RUKAVINA: Go off the record for one</p> <p>5 second.</p> <p>6 (Off the record.)</p> <p>7 Q. (BY MR. RUKAVINA) So a little bit of error</p> <p>8 on my part. We'll have some more metadata, but we can</p> <p>9 still talk about 6 and 7.</p> <p>10 It says the author JFORSHEE, J-F-O-R-S-H-E-E.</p> <p>11 Do you recall or do you know who that person was?</p> <p>12 A. I recognize the name, and it makes sense.</p> <p>13 This says Strasburger is the company. I think he was</p> <p>14 one of the lawyers that we had used at some point in</p> <p>15 time.</p> <p>16 Q. Strasburger is a law firm?</p> <p>17 A. Yes.</p> <p>18 Q. And then it says, so Exhibit 6 created May 3,</p> <p>19 Exhibit 7 created May 2, modified, accessed. Does that</p> <p>20 to the best of your understanding comport with when</p> <p>21 Exhibits 4 and 5 were actually created?</p> <p>22 A. Can you repeat that.</p> <p>23 Q. Yeah. We'll wait for the rest of the</p> <p>24 metadata. But let's go back to 4 and 5.</p> <p>25 In and by May 2019 I think you mentioned that</p>

Kristin Hendrix - October 27, 2021

<p style="text-align: right;">45</p> <p>1 it was your job to, I think you said update promissory 2 notes? 3 MR. MORRIS: Objection to the form of the 4 question. 5 Q. (BY MR. RUKAVINA) Let me take that question 6 back. 7 You testified earlier that your group would 8 have taken a template and used it to create or prepare 9 a new promissory note; right? 10 A. Right. 11 Q. How would you call that process? What word 12 would you use for that process? 13 A. Let's call it papering the loan. 14 Q. In May of 2019, was it your job to paper the 15 loan? 16 A. Yes. 17 Q. Would anyone else at the corporate accounting 18 group have been responsible to paper a loan? 19 A. At that time, I don't think so. I think I 20 was the one doing it. 21 Q. I think you mentioned that you think you 22 papered the loan, respecting Exhibits 4 and 5; correct? 23 A. Correct. 24 Q. You have no distinct present memory of 25 papering 4 and 5; correct?</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">47</p> <p>1 that Mr. Waterhouse's signature there appears on the 2 Word document as an image. 3 A. Uh-huh. 4 Q. Do you have any memory of whether there was 5 an image that someone would have affixed of 6 Mr. Waterhouse's signature to promissory notes? 7 A. Yes. We typically always -- he was 8 completely fine with having documentations -- sorry, 9 having documents signed or executed with his 10 e-signature. 11 Q. Would these pictures of his signature have 12 been his e-signature in May of 2019? 13 A. Yes. 14 Q. So let's just clarify that because I don't 15 want there to be any confusion. 16 I know there's some computer programs out 17 there that are restrictive and have passwords before 18 any signature is printed. And then there's some people 19 that use a stamp or an image; right? 20 MR. MORRIS: Objection to the form of the 21 question. 22 Q. (BY MR. RUKAVINA) Are you following me? 23 A. I follow you. 24 Q. In May of 2019, did Mr. Waterhouse have any 25 specific program that would have to -- you would have</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">46</p> <p>1 A. Correct. 2 Q. Can you think of anyone else at the corporate 3 accounting group that would have papered 4 and 5? 4 MR. MORRIS: Objection to the form of the 5 question. 6 THE WITNESS: The only other person that 7 could have would either be Dave Klos or Hayley Eliason. 8 Q. (BY MR. RUKAVINA) What was Hayley's role in 9 May of 2019? 10 A. She was the accountant. I can't recall her 11 specific title. 12 Q. Now, in May of 2019 when you papered a loan, 13 would you have consulted with either internal or 14 external legal before finishing that loan or presenting 15 it for signature or anything else? 16 A. Not if it was just our standard demand note 17 that we already had a template on. 18 Q. So would it have been your general course in 19 May of 2019, if you prepared Exhibits 4 and 5, not to 20 seek advice from internal or legal before proceeding 21 with these notes? 22 A. With these two specific notes? 23 Q. Yes. 24 A. Yes. 25 Q. If we flip the page, I'll represent to you</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">48</p> <p>1 to go through before it would spit out his e-signature, 2 or was he fine with you and his staff using an image 3 like this? 4 A. He was fine with using his e-signature, and 5 what is on these documents was that exact e-signature. 6 So I don't know if he had -- I don't know how it was 7 created originally. 8 Q. The e-signature? 9 A. E-signature. 10 Q. Do you have any memory with respect to 11 Exhibits 4 and 5 of getting Mr. Waterhouse's specific 12 approval to use his e-signature? 13 A. I don't have exact specific memory, same as 14 conversations on these loans. But he would have had to 15 approve this loan in the dollar amount, the day. 16 He would have been the one directing us to 17 create these loans. In past practice he has always 18 approved using his e-signature to execute documents. 19 Q. How would he have approved Exhibits 4 and 5? 20 By that, I mean by email or memorandum? How would he 21 have approved it in May of 2019? 22 MR. MORRIS: Objection to the form of the 23 question. 24 THE WITNESS: I would assume that, as I've 25 stated previously, these directions were coming</p>

Kristin Hendrix - October 27, 2021

<p style="text-align: right;">49</p> <p>1 directly from him to paper a loan. These changes that 2 are made are only to the dollar amount. Interest rate 3 is pulled right off the IRS website. 4 That is his approval to paper a loan and in 5 fact execute or approve the loan. 6 Q. (BY MR. RUKAVINA) In May of 2019, would 7 Mr. Waterhouse -- what was his practice as far as using 8 an ink signature on documents as opposed to an 9 e-signature? Did he have a practice? 10 MR. MORRIS: Objection to the form of the 11 question. 12 THE WITNESS: He has never specifically said, 13 on certain documents I would like to ink it with my 14 signature. Probably at this time, 99 percent of the 15 stuff my team got his signature on was his e-signature. 16 I think it just depended on the group and what it was. 17 Q. (BY MR. RUKAVINA) So how would he authorize 18 you or your team to use his e-signature for any given 19 document in May of 2019? 20 MR. MORRIS: Objection to the form of the 21 question. 22 THE WITNESS: Through the conversations that 23 would have been had before these emails went out saying 24 paper loan. 25 Q. (BY MR. RUKAVINA) And -- okay. So, and</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">51</p> <p>1 Q. But you have no memory of that authority or 2 approval, specifically for 4 and 5? 3 MR. MORRIS: Objection. Asked and answered 4 about five times. 5 THE WITNESS: Same as my answer I just gave. 6 Q. (BY MR. RUKAVINA) And I think you mentioned 7 that in your years at Highland your team papered 8 hundreds of loans? 9 A. Yeah. 10 Q. In your time at Highland, is it your 11 testimony that the accounting -- corporate accounting 12 department never made a mistake with respect to 13 anything that it did? 14 MR. MORRIS: Objection to the form of the 15 question. 16 THE WITNESS: No, I did not say that. 17 Q. (BY MR. RUKAVINA) Do you recall any mistakes 18 in your time at the corporate accounting group at 19 Highland that had been made, any significant mistakes? 20 MR. MORRIS: Objection to the form of the 21 question. 22 THE WITNESS: Significant mistakes, not that 23 I can recall. 24 Q. (BY MR. RUKAVINA) No accounts payable 25 mistakenly paid?</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">50</p> <p>1 after his e-signature was used either on these notes or 2 other documents in May of 2019, would you have brought 3 the documents back to him for any kind of verification? 4 MR. MORRIS: Objection to the form of the 5 question. 6 THE WITNESS: Probably not. These are all 7 very standard. We've papered hundreds of loans. So I 8 think he trusted that we can handle updating a date and 9 a dollar amount on these loan templates. 10 Q. (BY MR. RUKAVINA) Do you know or believe, or 11 your recent review of documents, did it reveal an email 12 from Mr. Waterhouse to you specifically authorizing his 13 e-signature on Exhibits 4 and/or 5? 14 A. Not that I recall seeing, no. 15 Q. Sitting here today, do you have any memory of 16 Mr. Waterhouse orally or otherwise specifically 17 authorizing you to affix his e-signature to Exhibits 4 18 and/or 5? 19 A. Specifically on these loans, no, I don't 20 recall those conversations. But, again, our practice 21 has always been we have this discussion, he's under the 22 understanding that we're going to paper the loans, he's 23 always comfortable with using his e-signature. 24 This is not something me or my team would 25 have done without that authority and approval from him.</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">52</p> <p>1 MR. MORRIS: Objection to the form of the 2 question. 3 THE WITNESS: I cannot specifically answer 4 that question with 17 years of work to recall, sorry. 5 MR. RUKAVINA: Just take a quick break. If 6 you need a restroom -- off the record. 7 (Off the record.) 8 Q. (BY MR. RUKAVINA) Going back to Exhibits 4 9 and 5. 10 Mr. Waterhouse signed these promissory notes. 11 Is there any particular reason why he signed them as 12 opposed to Dondero or someone else? 13 A. No particular reason. He's an officer for 14 both companies. He's a signatory. 15 Q. Who decided, if anyone, to your knowledge, 16 that he would be the one signing the notes, these two 17 notes? 18 A. I don't know who would have decided that, but 19 typically if Frank specifically wanted Jim Dondero to 20 sign it, he would say, take it to Jim to sign. 21 Q. Do you have a recollection of 22 Mr. Dondero -- strike that. 23 Do you have a recollection of Mr. Waterhouse 24 signing other promissory notes? 25 A. Yes. I know for sure he has signed other</p>

Kristin Hendrix - October 27, 2021

<p style="text-align: right;">53</p> <p>1 promissory notes. I can't tell you explicitly which 2 ones. 3 (Off the record.) 4 Q. (BY MR. RUKAVINA) Are you saying that in May 5 of 2019 -- strike that. 6 By May of 2019, was it not the standard 7 practice at the debtor that Mr. Dondero would sign 8 intercompany promissory notes? 9 MR. MORRIS: Objection to the form of the 10 question. 11 THE WITNESS: No, that's not standard 12 practice. Just needed to be somebody -- somebody who 13 is a signer for the entity on the incumbency 14 certificate. 15 Q. (BY MR. RUKAVINA) Was there a standard 16 practice, or did you just describe the standard 17 practice that it was someone on the incumbency 18 certificate? 19 A. That's correct, somebody on the incumbency 20 certificate. Frank is a great prospect to sign, with 21 giving direction to set loans up, send money out. Why 22 wouldn't he sign it. 23 Q. Do you have any memory sitting here today of 24 Mr. Waterhouse telling you or agreeing that he would be 25 signing these two promissory notes for HCMFA?</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">55</p> <p>1 Q. Well, let's go back a little bit in time. 2 Would you agree that at some point prior to 3 2019 the standard course was that paper notes were ink 4 signed? 5 MR. MORRIS: Objection to the form of the 6 question. 7 THE WITNESS: I could not tell you 8 specifically when notes were or were not ink signed. 9 Q. (BY MR. RUKAVINA) Was there any repository, 10 to the best of your recollection, as of May 2019 where 11 any ink-signed original promissory notes were kept by 12 the debtor? 13 A. No. We always would scan them in, save them 14 on our shared drive. Never had paper copies. 15 Q. So that's -- fixing to ask that question 16 next. 17 So Exhibits 4 and 5, would they even have 18 been printed after they were papered up? 19 MR. MORRIS: Objection to the form of the 20 question. 21 THE WITNESS: Possibly. Somebody could have 22 printed them. 23 Q. (BY MR. RUKAVINA) Do you remember printing 24 Exhibits 4 or 5 sitting here today? 25 A. I don't recall printing them myself, no.</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">54</p> <p>1 A. Not specifically, but he didn't need to tell 2 me. He typically would tell me if he wanted Jim to 3 sign them. 4 Q. Sitting here today, do you have any memory of 5 giving Mr. Waterhouse these two promissory notes after 6 they were prepared? 7 A. I specifically don't remember walking into 8 his office and providing it to him, but he could have 9 found it on our shared drive if he wanted to. 10 Q. Do you have any memory or in your recent 11 review of documents did you see any email to the effect 12 of you sending either or both of these promissory notes 13 to Mr. Waterhouse after they were papered up? 14 A. I don't have any specific recollection, 15 again, but he had access to look at them. 16 Q. On the shared drive? 17 A. Yes. 18 Q. In May -- I'm going to ask this question 19 multiple different ways, so let's start with kind of 20 the general. 21 In May or by May of 2019, was there a 22 repository, electronic or paper, where the debtor kept 23 original promissory notes that were owed -- where money 24 was owed to it? 25 A. Original meaning paper?</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">56</p> <p>1 Q. Would there have been a reason to print them 2 out if, as you said, the notes were stored 3 electronically? 4 MR. MORRIS: Objection to the form of the 5 question. 6 THE WITNESS: There could be a reason. I 7 don't recall that I for any reason printed these 8 particular notes. 9 Q. (BY MR. RUKAVINA) So as of May 2019, is it 10 your testimony that notes that were papered up by the 11 corporate accounting group would have been saved 12 electronically on the system and not kept by way of 13 paper copies in some file? 14 A. Correct. That's right. 15 Q. This is additional metadata. And you 16 understand I have a bit of an accent. 17 What are we on? 18 (Off the record.) 19 Q. (BY MR. RUKAVINA) Ms. Hendrix, Exhibit 8 is 20 going to be additional metadata for the May 3, 2019, 21 note that we've been looking at, and Exhibit 9 will be 22 the same thing for the May 2 note that we've been 23 looking at. 24 That's 8. That's 9. 25 (Whereupon, Exhibits 8 & 9 were marked for</p>

Kristin Hendrix - October 27, 2021

<p style="text-align: right;">57</p> <p>1 identification.)</p> <p>2 Q. (BY MR. RUKAVINA) Ms. Hendrix, I'm going to</p> <p>3 represent to you again that my office has faithfully</p> <p>4 printed this metadata out without doctoring or changing</p> <p>5 anything, and I ask you to assume that. If I'm wrong</p> <p>6 on that, then your answers don't count.</p> <p>7 Ma'am, as I look at these two documents, it</p> <p>8 says last modified by Kristin Hendrix.</p> <p>9 Do you see that?</p> <p>10 A. Yes.</p> <p>11 Q. And that would have -- that could have only</p> <p>12 been you; correct, in that department?</p> <p>13 A. I hope so, yes.</p> <p>14 Q. Seeing these two documents, can you agree</p> <p>15 with me now that it was in fact you that papered up</p> <p>16 Exhibits 4 and 5?</p> <p>17 MR. MORRIS: Objection. Asked and answered.</p> <p>18 THE WITNESS: I would assume so since my name</p> <p>19 is on it, yes.</p> <p>20 Q. (BY MR. RUKAVINA) Both of these documents</p> <p>21 say last printed -- I'm sorry. If you see related</p> <p>22 dates, it says last printed May 2, 2019, 11:27 A.M. Do</p> <p>23 you have any memory or any understanding as to why that</p> <p>24 date would be there or what last printed might mean?</p> <p>25 A. I don't know why it says last printed the day</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">59</p> <p>1 Obviously, you're welcome to use them anytime you need</p> <p>2 to, but I think we're done with those notes.</p> <p>3 Going to hand you what we're going to mark as</p> <p>4 Exhibit 10, which is an email chain produced by the</p> <p>5 debtor.</p> <p>6 And I don't know how anyone on the video will</p> <p>7 see it. I apologize. I'll have to send it to you</p> <p>8 later.</p> <p>9 (Whereupon, Exhibit 10 was marked for</p> <p>10 identification.)</p> <p>11 Q. (BY MR. RUKAVINA) Now, if you start with</p> <p>12 this email chain, it starts on November 19, 2020 from</p> <p>13 Jack Donohue to you, copying Mr. Seery and various</p> <p>14 others.</p> <p>15 Do you see that?</p> <p>16 A. Yes.</p> <p>17 Q. And Mr. Donohue is asking you to provide him</p> <p>18 the financial records of HCMFA due to the funds owed</p> <p>19 the debtor.</p> <p>20 Do you see that?</p> <p>21 A. Yes.</p> <p>22 Q. Do you recall that email from Mr. Donohue to</p> <p>23 you?</p> <p>24 A. Yes.</p> <p>25 Q. Do you recall any context or subsequent</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">58</p> <p>1 before it was created. That doesn't make any sense. I</p> <p>2 have no idea.</p> <p>3 Unless, the only thing I could think of is if</p> <p>4 we changed this template. When I say "this," the</p> <p>5 \$2.4 million loan, which was papered on the 2nd, and</p> <p>6 then used it for the next day for the template to</p> <p>7 update the date, possibly. I have no idea.</p> <p>8 Q. Well, it may be -- and I understand that you</p> <p>9 don't have any memory; we're speculating a little bit.</p> <p>10 It may be, looking at Exhibits 8 and 9, that</p> <p>11 the \$2.4 million note was printed on May 2, and then</p> <p>12 after having been used as the template for the</p> <p>13 \$5 million note, the \$5 million note would not have</p> <p>14 been printed.</p> <p>15 Does that sound possible?</p> <p>16 MR. MORRIS: Objection to the form of the</p> <p>17 question.</p> <p>18 THE WITNESS: Sure, it could be possible.</p> <p>19 Q. (BY MR. RUKAVINA) But you don't have any</p> <p>20 memory either way?</p> <p>21 A. No. And when these were printed they're</p> <p>22 printed to PDF, I believe, is probably what that means.</p> <p>23 Q. Okay.</p> <p>24 We're going to switch gears a little bit now,</p> <p>25 if you want to make a pile of those exhibits.</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">60</p> <p>1 discussions or how that email came to be, or do you</p> <p>2 just recall getting that email?</p> <p>3 A. I just recall getting the email.</p> <p>4 Q. You write back, hi Jack, Scott Ellington is</p> <p>5 going to follow up with the board on this request.</p> <p>6 Do you see that?</p> <p>7 A. Yes.</p> <p>8 Q. Do you recall why you told Jack that</p> <p>9 Mr. Ellington was going to follow up?</p> <p>10 A. From what I recall, I had asked Frank</p> <p>11 Waterhouse if it was okay to send these financials</p> <p>12 over, and he wanted me to check with Scott Ellington</p> <p>13 and that was Scott's response.</p> <p>14 Q. And did he tell you why he wanted you to</p> <p>15 check with Scott Ellington?</p> <p>16 A. Just to make sure that there were no issues</p> <p>17 with sending them over.</p> <p>18 Q. Mr. Seery writes back, can I get this ASAP.</p> <p>19 HCMFA is way overdue.</p> <p>20 Do you see that?</p> <p>21 A. Yes.</p> <p>22 Q. And Mr. Seery writes again, it's about a week</p> <p>23 later, and he says, this is an explicit direction from</p> <p>24 me as CEO of HCMLP. But it looks like you are the</p> <p>25 recipient of that December 2 email; correct?</p>

Kristin Hendrix - October 27, 2021

<p style="text-align: right;">61</p> <p>1 A. Yes.</p> <p>2 Q. Do you remember him sending you that email</p> <p>3 and copying those people?</p> <p>4 A. Yes.</p> <p>5 Q. Do you remember anything happening in that</p> <p>6 week between his November 25 and December 2 email along</p> <p>7 the same discussion lines?</p> <p>8 A. I don't remember anything. I think I was</p> <p>9 probably left out of any discussions, and if there were</p> <p>10 any, it was with Scott Ellington and whomever he had</p> <p>11 discussions with.</p> <p>12 Q. Then subsequent, on December 2, Mr. Seery</p> <p>13 writes, all, Scott and I have spoken and agree that the</p> <p>14 information should be provided to James immediately.</p> <p>15 Would that have been James Romey, do you</p> <p>16 think?</p> <p>17 A. Yes.</p> <p>18 Q. And who was James Romey?</p> <p>19 A. He also worked for DSI.</p> <p>20 Q. And then he writes, Kristin, please proceed</p> <p>21 with James. If anyone has any questions or issues,</p> <p>22 please call me.</p> <p>23 Do you see that?</p> <p>24 A. Yes.</p> <p>25 Q. Did you proceed with James Romey?</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">63</p> <p>1 you, copying Waterhouse, Seery, a bunch of others.</p> <p>2 Where he says, at the direction of Jim Seery,</p> <p>3 please provide DSI with the requested information for</p> <p>4 each entity below.</p> <p>5 And you'll see the entity includes both of my</p> <p>6 clients, NexPoint Advisors and HCMFA. And the</p> <p>7 information includes bank statements, income</p> <p>8 statements, balance sheets, cash flows.</p> <p>9 Do you see that?</p> <p>10 A. Yes.</p> <p>11 Q. Do you recall this email?</p> <p>12 A. Vaguely, yes.</p> <p>13 Q. Did you have any concerns when you received</p> <p>14 this email?</p> <p>15 A. Concerns about the email, no. I probably</p> <p>16 checked with -- I would have checked with Frank to make</p> <p>17 sure it was okay to send this first.</p> <p>18 Q. Frank Waterhouse?</p> <p>19 A. Yes.</p> <p>20 Q. Do you have any understanding as to why</p> <p>21 Mr. Donohue requested bank statements, income</p> <p>22 statements, balance sheets for NexPoint and/or HCMFA?</p> <p>23 A. I do not.</p> <p>24 Q. Did he or anyone at DSI tell you why they</p> <p>25 were requesting that?</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">62</p> <p>1 A. I further made sure that Scott was okay, to</p> <p>2 confirm. He said yes, please do, and I did send them</p> <p>3 to James Romey.</p> <p>4 Q. So Mr. Seery has some of it in this email</p> <p>5 chain, but do you have any understanding as to why</p> <p>6 either DSI or Mr. Seery in November of 2020 was asking</p> <p>7 for the financial records of HCMFA?</p> <p>8 A. I do not, other than what's in this email.</p> <p>9 Q. Did you discuss with either DSI or Mr. Seery</p> <p>10 or Mr. Waterhouse in November or December 2020 whether</p> <p>11 the demand notes from HCMFA should be demanded, should</p> <p>12 be called?</p> <p>13 A. I did not have discussions.</p> <p>14 Q. Next exhibit is Exhibit 11. This is another</p> <p>15 email chain.</p> <p>16 And I apologize to the folks on the video.</p> <p>17 I'll have to get it to you during some break.</p> <p>18 MR. MORRIS: Hold on one second.</p> <p>19 MR. RUKAVINA: Sure. Off the record.</p> <p>20 (Off the record.)</p> <p>21 (Whereupon, Exhibit 11 was marked for</p> <p>22 identification.)</p> <p>23 Q. (BY MR. RUKAVINA) Exhibit 11, Ms. Hendrix,</p> <p>24 if you'll go to the beginning of this email chain, is</p> <p>25 an email on January 6, 2021, again from Mr. Donohue to</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">64</p> <p>1 A. Not that I can recall.</p> <p>2 Q. If we go forward in time, you'll see that</p> <p>3 Mr. Waterhouse is writing back to Mr. Donohue. And</p> <p>4 then Mr. Seery interjects and says, these are HCMLP</p> <p>5 business records. Please provide them as requested by</p> <p>6 Jack ASAP.</p> <p>7 Do you see that?</p> <p>8 A. Yes.</p> <p>9 Q. And it looks like you were not privy to</p> <p>10 subsequent communications where Frank and Jim were</p> <p>11 talking back and forth about this. You were not privy</p> <p>12 to those, like you weren't blind copied or anything to</p> <p>13 your recollection?</p> <p>14 A. No.</p> <p>15 Q. Did you in fact on or after January 6, 2021,</p> <p>16 provide Mr. Donohue or anyone on his team the</p> <p>17 information that he had requested as it relates to</p> <p>18 NexPoint and/or HCMFA?</p> <p>19 A. Without going back to check, I couldn't</p> <p>20 answer yes or no for certain.</p> <p>21 Q. So I think you mentioned when you received</p> <p>22 the email from Mr. Donohue you would have checked with</p> <p>23 Frank. And what do you remember asking Frank or</p> <p>24 checking with him about?</p> <p>25 A. I don't remember asking him specifically. In</p>

Kristin Hendrix - October 27, 2021

<p style="text-align: right;">65</p> <p>1 fact, it's possible that Frank just responded on his 2 own here to Jack. Again, would have been a 3 conversation that I can't specifically recall. 4 Q. Sure. And you don't specifically remember 5 today providing Mr. Donohue any of that information; 6 right? 7 A. Right. 8 Q. You don't specifically remember today having 9 a discussion with Mr. Donohue or Seery or anyone else 10 at or about that time as to why they were wanting this 11 information? 12 A. Correct. 13 Q. Exhibit 12, Ms. Hendrix, is going to be the 14 December 3, 2020, letter by which Highland called the 15 notes. 16 MR. MORRIS: Objection to the form of the 17 question if there was one. 18 (Whereupon, Exhibit 12 was marked for 19 identification.) 20 Q. (BY MR. RUKAVINA) Are you familiar with 21 Exhibit 12, Ms. Hendrix? 22 A. No, I haven't seen this. 23 Q. Prior to today, you don't remember seeing 24 this? 25 A. No.</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">67</p> <p>1 to? 2 A. We had a standing weekly cash meeting with 3 Frank Waterhouse, myself, Jim Seery. I can't recall 4 everyone on it. Some of the DSI folks. We go through 5 cash forecasts. It's a 13-week cash forecast. We go 6 through it every week. 7 It's going to lay out incoming and outgoing 8 payments that are forecasted, of which these term loans 9 were in those forecasts, so they were discussed. 10 Q. And Mr. Morris produced some of those to me 11 this morning. I haven't had time to go through them. 12 But it is your recollection in November and 13 December of 2020 the fact of the NexPoint term note 14 being out there was known to Mr. Seery? 15 A. Yes. 16 Q. And the fact of an upcoming December 31, 17 2020, payment was known to Mr. Seery? 18 A. Yes. 19 Q. So with that background, in November and 20 December of 2020, do you remember discussing with 21 anyone anything to the effect of, oh, it really would 22 be better if NexPoint defaulted on that note so we 23 could call it? 24 A. No. 25 Q. Did Mr. Seery ever state to you anything in</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">66</p> <p>1 Q. I think you're answering no? 2 A. No, sorry, no. 3 Q. On or before December 3, 2020, did anyone 4 discuss with you whether Highland should call the 5 demand notes that were outstanding by HCMFA? 6 A. No. 7 Q. Do you recall in December 2020 any discussion 8 with anyone at the debtor about the NexPoint 9 \$30.7 million term note? 10 A. Repeat your question again, please. 11 Q. Sure. So you're familiar, and we'll talk 12 about it in some detail, with the NexPoint 13 \$30.7 million note? 14 A. Yes. 15 Q. And again, we'll talk about it, but at that 16 point in time that was a term note; correct? 17 A. Correct. 18 Q. Do you remember in the December 2020 or 19 November 2020 time frame discussing with anyone at the 20 debtor the status of that NexPoint note? 21 A. Yes, we would have discussed this on a weekly 22 basis in our cash meetings that we would have had, as 23 identifying that there are payments due on these loans 24 in December. 25 Q. What weekly cash meetings are you referring</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">68</p> <p>1 November or December of 2020 about how the debtor might 2 monetize that NexPoint note? 3 A. No. 4 Q. Did he discuss with you any potential sale of 5 that promissory note? 6 A. No. 7 Q. Did DSI ever discuss with you in November or 8 December 2020 any potential sale of that note? 9 A. No. 10 Q. Or how to monetize that note? 11 A. No. 12 Q. So -- well, strike that. 13 Did Mr. Seery or anyone at DSI, or anyone at 14 all, in November or December of 2020 state any words to 15 you to the effect that they were hoping that NexPoint 16 would default on that note? 17 A. Never. 18 Q. Or that it would be in the debtor's interest 19 for NexPoint to default on that note? 20 A. No. 21 Q. In November or December of 2020, do you 22 recall having any discussions with Mr. Seery or anyone 23 at DSI as to the collectibility of that note? And by 24 that I mean whether NexPoint can pay the note? 25 A. I don't specifically recall. It most likely</p>

Kristin Hendrix - October 27, 2021

<p style="text-align: right;">69</p> <p>1 came up in cash conversations.</p> <p>2 Q. I think you were assistant controller back</p> <p>3 then?</p> <p>4 A. Yes.</p> <p>5 Q. Would a discussion of a borrower's ability to</p> <p>6 repay have been something within your general sphere of</p> <p>7 responsibility in that time frame?</p> <p>8 MR. MORRIS: Objection to the form of the</p> <p>9 question.</p> <p>10 THE WITNESS: It depends on who the borrower</p> <p>11 is, and at that time we did -- we had knowledge over</p> <p>12 that information, so yes.</p> <p>13 Q. (BY MR. RUKAVINA) Well, you've seen some</p> <p>14 instructions or requests from Mr. Seery to you and DSI</p> <p>15 to you for financial information of NexPoint and HCMFA.</p> <p>16 We've gone through those documents; right?</p> <p>17 A. Yes.</p> <p>18 Q. Does that refresh your memory that there was</p> <p>19 any internal discussion that you were privy to about</p> <p>20 the ability of HCMFA and/or NexPoint to pay these</p> <p>21 notes?</p> <p>22 A. I don't recall that specifically being asked.</p> <p>23 It could have.</p> <p>24 Q. Did you ever at any point in time have any</p> <p>25 employment or officer or any title or role with</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">71</p> <p>1 not?</p> <p>2 A. Yes.</p> <p>3 Q. What's your understanding?</p> <p>4 A. Either November 30 or December 1, 2020, I</p> <p>5 received a phone call from Frank Waterhouse that said,</p> <p>6 no payments are going from any of the Advisors to</p> <p>7 Highland.</p> <p>8 Q. Can you be more specific with what he said?</p> <p>9 A. That's what he said.</p> <p>10 Q. So he said no payments from the Advisors to</p> <p>11 Highland?</p> <p>12 A. Yes.</p> <p>13 Q. Did he reference the promissory note</p> <p>14 expressly?</p> <p>15 A. No.</p> <p>16 Q. But no payments means?</p> <p>17 A. Nothing.</p> <p>18 Q. That would logically in your mind include the</p> <p>19 promissory note?</p> <p>20 A. Yes.</p> <p>21 Q. Did you ask him why?</p> <p>22 A. No.</p> <p>23 Q. Did he tell you why?</p> <p>24 A. No.</p> <p>25 Q. Did you, prior to January 1, 2021, did you</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">70</p> <p>1 NexPoint Advisors, LP?</p> <p>2 A. No.</p> <p>3 Q. Were you ever the controller or assistant</p> <p>4 controller for NexPoint Advisors LP?</p> <p>5 A. No.</p> <p>6 Q. Did you ever at any point in time have any</p> <p>7 employment, officer or any title or role at HCMFA?</p> <p>8 A. No.</p> <p>9 Q. Were you ever the controller or assistant</p> <p>10 controller of HCMFA?</p> <p>11 A. No.</p> <p>12 Q. So you might have indirectly provided</p> <p>13 services to those two as part of shared services, but</p> <p>14 never directly; is that fair?</p> <p>15 MR. MORRIS: Objection to the form of the</p> <p>16 question.</p> <p>17 THE WITNESS: When you say never directly,</p> <p>18 meaning I was not employed by those entities?</p> <p>19 Q. (BY MR. RUKAVINA) Correct.</p> <p>20 A. That's correct.</p> <p>21 Q. Do you have any understanding -- first of</p> <p>22 all, NexPoint did not make a payment on December 31,</p> <p>23 2020; correct?</p> <p>24 A. Correct.</p> <p>25 Q. Okay. Do you have any understanding of why</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">72</p> <p>1 hear from anyone as to why Mr. Waterhouse gave that</p> <p>2 instruction?</p> <p>3 A. Not that I recall.</p> <p>4 Q. Did you, after that November 30 or December 1</p> <p>5 phone call, did you follow up with him or anyone else</p> <p>6 about the upcoming note payment?</p> <p>7 A. I didn't have any reason to.</p> <p>8 Q. I'm going to -- let me find you a document</p> <p>9 for a moment.</p> <p>10 Just so the record is complete, let's include</p> <p>11 this promissory note. It's going to be Exhibit 13.</p> <p>12 This is the NexPoint promissory note.</p> <p>13 (Whereupon, Exhibit 13 was marked for</p> <p>14 identification.)</p> <p>15 Q. (BY MR. RUKAVINA) I take it you've seen this</p> <p>16 promissory note, Exhibit 13?</p> <p>17 A. Yes.</p> <p>18 Q. And I think you testified about this before,</p> <p>19 but just to summarize to save time.</p> <p>20 This would have been a note that you would</p> <p>21 not have papered but would have gone through legal</p> <p>22 because it was a roll-up. Is that generally accurate?</p> <p>23 A. Yes.</p> <p>24 Q. And do you have any memory at all of having</p> <p>25 anything to do with papering up this loan?</p>

Kristin Hendrix - October 27, 2021

<p style="text-align: right;">73</p> <p>1 A. Not that I recall.</p> <p>2 Q. Would you have had, after 2017 and before</p> <p>3 2021, any role with respect to any payments or upcoming</p> <p>4 payments on this note, any role at all?</p> <p>5 A. Yes.</p> <p>6 Q. What would have been your role or roles?</p> <p>7 A. That would have been taking direction from</p> <p>8 Frank Waterhouse or possibly Jim Dondero saying, go</p> <p>9 ahead and make these payments that are due on these</p> <p>10 term notes.</p> <p>11 Q. Would you have recorded on any books or</p> <p>12 records payments that actually were made?</p> <p>13 A. Not me personally.</p> <p>14 Q. Who would have?</p> <p>15 A. Our accountant, which could have been one of</p> <p>16 two different people, depending on the time frame.</p> <p>17 Q. Would you have had any role with respect to</p> <p>18 recording those payments or is that just something that</p> <p>19 your group would have done?</p> <p>20 MR. MORRIS: Objection to the form of the</p> <p>21 question.</p> <p>22 THE WITNESS: I would not have had a role.</p> <p>23 My group would have.</p> <p>24 Q. (BY MR. RUKAVINA) What about calculating</p> <p>25 amortization and/or interest payments that are due or</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">75</p> <p>1 A. At my house.</p> <p>2 Q. Did you answer on a cell phone or landline?</p> <p>3 A. My cell phone.</p> <p>4 Q. Is there any chance in hell that your cell</p> <p>5 phone would still have a record of that phone call,</p> <p>6 like what time it was and how long it lasted?</p> <p>7 MR. MORRIS: Objection to the form of the</p> <p>8 question.</p> <p>9 Q. (BY MR. RUKAVINA) I apologize for using</p> <p>10 hell.</p> <p>11 MR. MORRIS: And to foundation.</p> <p>12 THE WITNESS: I have no idea.</p> <p>13 Q. (BY MR. RUKAVINA) Do you have your cell</p> <p>14 phone with you right now?</p> <p>15 A. In the other room.</p> <p>16 Q. I might ask you during the break to just --</p> <p>17 we'll take a short break before I'm done, and I'll ask</p> <p>18 you if you've had a chance to look for November and</p> <p>19 December 2020 phone logs between you and</p> <p>20 Mr. Waterhouse. I would ask you to do that, please.</p> <p>21 A. Sure.</p> <p>22 Q. And I apologize, I think you said you thought</p> <p>23 it was a short telephone call?</p> <p>24 A. I have no idea.</p> <p>25 Q. Did the telephone call or Mr. Waterhouse's</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">74</p> <p>1 upcoming? Who would have done that, you or someone</p> <p>2 else?</p> <p>3 A. Our accountant.</p> <p>4 Q. Do you have any memory of doing that?</p> <p>5 MR. MORRIS: Objection to the form of the</p> <p>6 question.</p> <p>7 THE WITNESS: Not during 2017 through 2019.</p> <p>8 Q. (BY MR. RUKAVINA) What about 2020?</p> <p>9 A. No.</p> <p>10 Q. Going back to that November 30 or December 1</p> <p>11 telephone call, do you recall who initiated the call?</p> <p>12 A. To me?</p> <p>13 Q. The one between you and Mr. Waterhouse.</p> <p>14 A. Frank called me.</p> <p>15 Q. Frank called you.</p> <p>16 And was it just to discuss -- or just to give</p> <p>17 you that instruction, no payments from the Advisors, or</p> <p>18 was there other things discussed?</p> <p>19 A. I could not tell you if something else was</p> <p>20 discussed on that phone call.</p> <p>21 Q. Do you remember if it was a long phone call</p> <p>22 or short?</p> <p>23 A. Couldn't tell you.</p> <p>24 Q. Do you remember where you were when he called</p> <p>25 you?</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">76</p> <p>1 instructions surprise you in any way?</p> <p>2 A. Nothing surprises me anymore, so no.</p> <p>3 Q. Did it surprise you back in November or</p> <p>4 December of 2020?</p> <p>5 A. No.</p> <p>6 Q. Did it pique your curiosity?</p> <p>7 A. Nope.</p> <p>8 Q. Just another instruction from your boss?</p> <p>9 A. Yep.</p> <p>10 Q. Exhibit 14 is going to be a document that</p> <p>11 we're not sure what it is and we're not sure who</p> <p>12 prepared it. It appears to be a ledger of charges</p> <p>13 against and payments on this promissory note.</p> <p>14 I'm just saying that so the people on the</p> <p>15 phone know what it is, but you don't have to take what</p> <p>16 I said as correct.</p> <p>17 (Whereupon, Exhibit 14 was marked for</p> <p>18 identification.)</p> <p>19 Q. (BY MR. RUKAVINA) So Ms. Hendrix, Exhibit 14</p> <p>20 was produced by the debtor. And I'm going to ask you,</p> <p>21 do you know what this is or have you seen it before?</p> <p>22 Can you help us state what it is?</p> <p>23 A. This looks like it is an amortization</p> <p>24 schedule of the NexPoint Advisors term loan.</p> <p>25 Q. Would this have been something that it</p>

Kristin Hendrix - October 27, 2021

<p style="text-align: right;">77</p> <p>1 appears to you would have been maintained internally by</p> <p>2 the debtor, or does it look like it might have been</p> <p>3 prepared by DSI or someone else for some other reason?</p> <p>4 A. It looks like the debtor's amortization</p> <p>5 schedule that they kept.</p> <p>6 Q. Did the debtor keep an amortization schedule</p> <p>7 for the NexPoint promissory note, to your knowledge?</p> <p>8 A. Yes.</p> <p>9 Q. Did the debtor keep amortization schedules</p> <p>10 for other term promissory notes?</p> <p>11 A. Yes.</p> <p>12 Q. In what format, like Excel spreadsheets or</p> <p>13 Word documents? What is your recollection for NexPoint</p> <p>14 specifically?</p> <p>15 A. Excel.</p> <p>16 Q. Would that have been on the shared system or</p> <p>17 something?</p> <p>18 A. Yes.</p> <p>19 Q. And who would have been responsible on an</p> <p>20 ongoing basis to update the NexPoint amortization</p> <p>21 schedule?</p> <p>22 MR. MORRIS: Objection to the form of the</p> <p>23 question.</p> <p>24 THE WITNESS: Depends on what time you're</p> <p>25 asking.</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">79</p> <p>1 change but it doesn't use brackets?</p> <p>2 A. It's a negative number. It's just a</p> <p>3 formatting issue.</p> <p>4 Q. What about also on that same page in the</p> <p>5 other column, principal paid, 5/31/2020, it's a</p> <p>6 positive number, 575,550.</p> <p>7 MR. MORRIS: Where are you?</p> <p>8 MR. RUKAVINA: On page 2 of this exhibit.</p> <p>9 MR. MORRIS: What date?</p> <p>10 MR. RUKAVINA: May 31, 2020. And it's the</p> <p>11 column over, principal paid. It's a positive number,</p> <p>12 575,000 and change.</p> <p>13 MR. MORRIS: Got it, thank you.</p> <p>14 Q. (BY MR. RUKAVINA) Do you see that,</p> <p>15 Ms. Hendrix?</p> <p>16 A. Yes.</p> <p>17 Q. Do you have an understanding of why that</p> <p>18 number would be positive?</p> <p>19 A. Actually, I think this looks like an entry to</p> <p>20 me where the interest is what we call picking. So on</p> <p>21 the anniversary date of this loan, which is May, from</p> <p>22 what I can tell, the accrued interest total, which is</p> <p>23 that 575-, is being rolled into principal.</p> <p>24 That's what I can tell from looking at it.</p> <p>25 Q. Okay. Do you have any understanding as to</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">78</p> <p>1 Q. (BY MR. RUKAVINA) Let's talk about the year</p> <p>2 of 2020.</p> <p>3 A. That would have been Hayley Eliason, our</p> <p>4 accountant at that time.</p> <p>5 Q. What about the year 2019?</p> <p>6 A. Still Hayley.</p> <p>7 MR. RUKAVINA: I'm going to just ask, to</p> <p>8 preserve the record, Mr. Morris, if he hasn't already,</p> <p>9 to produce any such Excel spreadsheet in the native</p> <p>10 form.</p> <p>11 Q. (BY MR. RUKAVINA) If we look at this,</p> <p>12 Ms. Hendrix -- and I'm a little confused as to what</p> <p>13 these entries mean. Maybe you could help me. But</p> <p>14 columns that say interest paid, principal paid, total</p> <p>15 paid, do you know what those columns mean?</p> <p>16 A. Exactly as they state. These are interest</p> <p>17 and principal payments made on the date that's listed,</p> <p>18 and then you've got a total.</p> <p>19 Q. And then they're in brackets because they're</p> <p>20 negative numbers?</p> <p>21 A. Correct.</p> <p>22 Q. So here's what I'm not understanding. Go to</p> <p>23 the second page.</p> <p>24 You see there's an entry under interest paid</p> <p>25 12/30/29 [verbatim] that says negative 530,000 and</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">80</p> <p>1 why that would have been done or why that would have</p> <p>2 been done on that day?</p> <p>3 MR. MORRIS: Objection to the form of the</p> <p>4 question.</p> <p>5 THE WITNESS: Because that's the anniversary</p> <p>6 date of the loan. I would assume that that's how the</p> <p>7 loan is written.</p> <p>8 Q. (BY MR. RUKAVINA) And I think that that</p> <p>9 Section 1 of the promissory note does say, the unpaid</p> <p>10 principal balance of this note from time to time</p> <p>11 outstanding shall bear interest.</p> <p>12 At the rate of 6 percent per annum from the</p> <p>13 date hereof until maturity date, compounded annually on</p> <p>14 the anniversary of the date of this note.</p> <p>15 Do you see that?</p> <p>16 MR. MORRIS: Objection to the form of the</p> <p>17 question.</p> <p>18 THE WITNESS: Yeah, I see that.</p> <p>19 Q. (BY MR. RUKAVINA) Assuming that this is the</p> <p>20 correct amortization schedule for the NexPoint note,</p> <p>21 and that the numbers in here are correct, if you look</p> <p>22 at the second page under the column total paid there</p> <p>23 are a number of entries for 2019.</p> <p>24 Do you see that, the far right column?</p> <p>25 A. At the top, yes.</p>

Kristin Hendrix - October 27, 2021

<p style="text-align: right;">81</p> <p>1 Q. For example, 1.3 million, 2.1 million, 2 1.3 million. 3 Do you see that? 4 A. Yes. 5 Q. Assuming that that's correct, do you have any 6 memory or understanding whether in the year 2019, or 7 why NexPoint was making these payments on this 8 promissory note? 9 A. Without going back and reading through emails 10 I can only assume that, from looking at this, Highland, 11 the debtor, would have needed cash, and so this is one 12 way of getting cash to the debtor. 13 Q. This is kind of like what we discussed in the 14 beginning, that Mr. Dondero on a cash needed basis 15 would just transfer money between entities? 16 A. Yes. 17 Q. Do you have any memory in the first half of 18 2019 whether Highland, the debtor, had any particular 19 need for cash money at that time? 20 A. We generally always had a need for cash, so 21 yes. 22 Q. And so if NexPoint was transferring money 23 back to Highland on this note because Highland needed 24 the money, would those have been recorded as 25 prepayments by the debtor?</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">83</p> <p>1 Exhibit 15 and I'm going to represent to you that it's 2 the email that Mr. Morris sent to me today and I've not 3 doctored it in any way. 4 (Whereupon, Exhibit 15 was marked for 5 identification.) 6 MR. MORRIS: Do you have the email that it 7 was attached to? 8 MR. RUKAVINA: Somewhere. I can find it at a 9 break. 10 MR. MORRIS: I'll let the witness testify. 11 This was attached to an email. Not my email, but 12 another email. But I'll let the witness testify. 13 MR. RUKAVINA: Off the record. 14 (Off the record.) 15 Q. (BY MR. RUKAVINA) So you have Exhibit 15. 16 And during the break we established, I don't 17 have a copy of it right now, but you sent Exhibit 15 on 18 August 29, 2020, to Mr. Dondero by email, copying 19 Mr. Waterhouse, as well as a couple of other 20 attachments; is that correct? 21 A. Correct. 22 Q. Do you recall what prompted you to send that 23 email and this attachment? 24 A. Yes. 25 Q. What?</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">82</p> <p>1 MR. MORRIS: Objection to the form of the 2 question. 3 THE WITNESS: Yes. 4 Q. (BY MR. RUKAVINA) Sitting here today, do you 5 have any reason to believe based on the formatting or 6 anything on Exhibit 14 that it's not the amortization 7 schedule as it was maintained by the debtor? 8 A. I don't have any reason to not believe that 9 it was. 10 Q. Going to show you a few documents that I'm 11 hopefully going to burn through, but you're certainly 12 entitled to take all the time that you need. 13 So first is going to be a document that 14 Mr. Morris produced this morning. It's not Bates 15 labeled. I don't know why. 16 MR. MORRIS: As I said in my email, my 17 paralegal is sick and so I wanted you to have the 18 documents. We'll Bates stamp them later, but we have a 19 written record from my email of what we produced to 20 you. 21 MR. RUKAVINA: You're assuming that I read my 22 emails. 23 MR. MORRIS: Sorry about that. I confess, 24 sometimes I don't as well. 25 Q. (BY MR. RUKAVINA) So I'm going to hand you</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">84</p> <p>1 A. Frank Waterhouse called me on August 29, and 2 requested that I do so. 3 Q. Did he tell you why? 4 A. From what I recall, this was a time when Jim 5 was trying to come up with his bargain or pop land, 6 whatever he referenced it as. This was all information 7 that Frank said he wanted. 8 Q. Okay. So going back to Exhibit 15, what I'm 9 interested in is NexPoint Advisors, the 23,846,000 and 10 change number. 11 Do you see that? 12 A. Yes. 13 Q. Where did that number -- or where did this 14 Exhibit 15 come from, if you understand my question? 15 A. Sure. These numbers should all be balances 16 off of the corresponding notes that each entity owed to 17 the debtor. 18 Q. Did you or someone prepare Exhibit 15 19 specifically for that email? Or was Exhibit 15 already 20 existing somewhere on the system? 21 A. I believe that we prepared it specifically 22 for this request. 23 Q. Do you recall who? 24 A. It was either myself or our accountant. I 25 don't recall who put it together.</p>

Kristin Hendrix - October 27, 2021

<p style="text-align: right;">85</p> <p>1 Q. Okay. And where would that 23 million and 2 change number for NexPoint have come from, an 3 amortization schedule? 4 A. Yes. 5 Q. And what about Highland Capital Management 6 Fund Advisors? You see \$10.5 million and change demand 7 on Exhibit 15? 8 A. Yes. 9 Q. Where would that \$10.5 million number have 10 come from, do you remember? 11 A. The same. It would have come off of the 12 amortization schedules for all of their notes. 13 Q. How was there an amortization schedule for a 14 demand note? 15 A. Because it's accruing interest. 16 Q. So sitting here today, you expect there would 17 be some amortization schedule like Exhibit 14 but for 18 HCMFA? 19 A. Yes. 20 Q. Now we're going to have an exhibit [verbatim] 21 chain that's going to be marked as Exhibit 16. 22 (Whereupon, Exhibit 16 was marked for 23 identification.) 24 MR. RUKAVINA: For the folks on the video, 25 Exhibit 16 is the email chain that Mr. Morris used last</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">87</p> <p>1 Do you see that, ma'am? 2 A. Yes. 3 Q. 23 million 683? 4 A. Yes. 5 Q. And you see, HCMFA due to HCMLP as of 6 June 30, 2020, 12,286,000? 7 MR. MORRIS: Objection to the form of the 8 question. 9 Q. (BY MR. RUKAVINA) Strike that. 10 It says 12,286. What do you take that 12,286 11 to mean? 12 A. I think that's a typo and it should have 13 said -- well, there's several things wrong with this, 14 from looking at it. 15 She left off three zeros on the end of it. 16 Should have said 12,286,000. Secondly, that amount is 17 our due to affiliates on HCMFA's books, not just due to 18 HCMLP. 19 Q. That was going to be my question, why that 20 12,286,000 number didn't jive with the 10,530,000 21 number on Exhibit 15? 22 A. Yes, there's another loan due to a different 23 affiliate. 24 Q. So that \$12,286,000 amount doesn't mean that 25 it's all due to Highland; is that correct?</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">86</p> <p>1 week regarding the Section 15(c) document. 2 Q. (BY MR. RUKAVINA) Are you familiar with this 3 Exhibit 16 email chain, Ms. Hendrix? 4 A. Yes. 5 Q. Why are you familiar with it? 6 A. Well, I'm copied on it, and I saw it 7 yesterday. 8 Q. Do you have any memory -- well, that's a 9 stupid question. But prior to yesterday, did you have 10 any memory of this? 11 A. Yes. 12 Q. And do you recall the context or the purpose 13 of this exhibit, or this email chain? 14 A. From what I remember this is the time where 15 information was being prepared for the retail board to 16 re-up the debtor's shared services. 17 Q. So, here -- you're certainly welcome to read 18 it in its entirety and if you feel like you want to or 19 need to, that's fine. But I only have one question. 20 Well, one question with two subparts. 21 I'm looking at Ms. Lauren Thedford's, 22 T-h-e-d-f-o-r-d's, email October 6, 2000 [verbatim] 23 where she says, I see the below from the 6/30 24 financials. NPA, due to HCMLP and affiliates as of 25 June 30, 2020.</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">88</p> <p>1 A. Correct. 2 Q. Exhibit 17 is going to be the January 7, 2021 3 notice from the debtor to NexPoint about the default. 4 (Whereupon, Exhibit 17 was marked for 5 identification.) 6 Q. (BY MR. RUKAVINA) You've been handed 7 Exhibit 17. Have you seen this document before? 8 A. Not that I believe. 9 Q. And I think we've asked this before, but just 10 to clarify. 11 Did anyone at the debtor, including Mr. Seery 12 or DSI, discuss with you after December 31, 2020 that 13 the payment had not been made and what, if anything, 14 the debtor should do about that? 15 MR. MORRIS: Objection to the form of the 16 question. 17 THE WITNESS: I can't recall specific 18 conversations that may or may not have been had around 19 that topic. 20 Q. (BY MR. RUKAVINA) Would -- so back then you 21 were the assistant controller, on January 7; right? 22 A. Yes. 23 Q. Do you think that back then Mr. Seery or DSI 24 would have sought your advice or input as to what they 25 should do about the missed payment?</p>

Kristin Hendrix - October 27, 2021

<p style="text-align: right;">89</p> <p>1 A. No.</p> <p>2 MR. MORRIS: Objection to the form of the</p> <p>3 question.</p> <p>4 THE WITNESS: No.</p> <p>5 Q. (BY MR. RUKAVINA) That would have been</p> <p>6 outside of your purview?</p> <p>7 A. Yes.</p> <p>8 Q. And you see in this notice in the middle, it</p> <p>9 says an amount due as of January 8 in the \$24,471,000</p> <p>10 range.</p> <p>11 Do you see that?</p> <p>12 A. Yes.</p> <p>13 Q. Do you have any idea, I take it you don't,</p> <p>14 where that number came from?</p> <p>15 MR. MORRIS: Objection to the form of the</p> <p>16 question.</p> <p>17 THE WITNESS: I don't know who provided that</p> <p>18 number or where it came from.</p> <p>19 Q. (BY MR. RUKAVINA) Do you have any</p> <p>20 understanding as to why that number is higher than the</p> <p>21 number on Exhibit 15?</p> <p>22 A. My guess would be that Exhibit 15 is just</p> <p>23 principal balances.</p> <p>24 Q. Okay.</p> <p>25 Exhibit 18, please.</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">91</p> <p>1 Q. Were you aware of it then?</p> <p>2 A. Was I aware of what?</p> <p>3 Q. That transfer of \$1.4 million and change.</p> <p>4 A. On January 14?</p> <p>5 Q. Yes.</p> <p>6 A. Yes.</p> <p>7 Q. Did you facilitate that transfer?</p> <p>8 A. Yes.</p> <p>9 Q. Who told you to make that transfer?</p> <p>10 A. Frank Waterhouse.</p> <p>11 Q. Did he tell you why?</p> <p>12 A. Nope.</p> <p>13 Q. He just said make the transfer?</p> <p>14 A. Yes.</p> <p>15 Q. Did he tell you that it was on account of the</p> <p>16 NexPoint note?</p> <p>17 A. Yes.</p> <p>18 Q. Did he tell you how to, if at all, to credit</p> <p>19 that note for that amount?</p> <p>20 A. No.</p> <p>21 Q. Sitting here today, you have no memory other</p> <p>22 than that Frank Waterhouse told you to transfer some</p> <p>23 \$1.4 million on the NexPoint note?</p> <p>24 A. Right.</p> <p>25 Q. And do you recall, was that oral or written</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">90</p> <p>1 (Whereupon, Exhibit 18 was marked for</p> <p>2 identification.)</p> <p>3 Q. (BY MR. RUKAVINA) Exhibit 18, Ms. Hendrix,</p> <p>4 is an email chain between you and Mr. Waterhouse on</p> <p>5 January 12, 2021. Do you remember this email chain?</p> <p>6 A. No.</p> <p>7 Q. Do you remember on January 12 Mr. Waterhouse</p> <p>8 emailing you, asking when the last amort payment due</p> <p>9 and what the amount was for NexPoint?</p> <p>10 A. No.</p> <p>11 Q. When was the last time -- well, strike that.</p> <p>12 Do you remember ever seeing this email</p> <p>13 between then and today?</p> <p>14 A. No.</p> <p>15 Q. Do you have any present memory of any</p> <p>16 communications with Mr. Waterhouse on or about</p> <p>17 January 12, 2021 regarding the NexPoint default or</p> <p>18 note?</p> <p>19 A. Not specific, no.</p> <p>20 Q. Any general memory?</p> <p>21 A. Not that I can pinpoint, no.</p> <p>22 Q. Were you aware that on or about January 14</p> <p>23 NexPoint transferred about \$1.4 million and change to</p> <p>24 the debtor?</p> <p>25 A. Yes.</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">92</p> <p>1 or how would that have been?</p> <p>2 A. That was a phone call.</p> <p>3 Q. Do you recall who initiated the phone call?</p> <p>4 A. Frank called me.</p> <p>5 Q. Was that the only topic discussed in that</p> <p>6 phone call to your memory?</p> <p>7 A. Yes.</p> <p>8 Q. Did you ask him why the payment or</p> <p>9 anything -- did you ask him anything at all?</p> <p>10 A. No.</p> <p>11 Q. And after you made the payment -- or I'm</p> <p>12 sorry, after you caused the payment to be made, did you</p> <p>13 take any further steps with respect to the NexPoint</p> <p>14 note?</p> <p>15 A. I forwarded the payment confirmation, showing</p> <p>16 that the money was sent from NexPoint Advisors to</p> <p>17 Highland, forwarded that payment confirmation from the</p> <p>18 bank to Jack Donohue at DSI, letting him know.</p> <p>19 Q. Did you let Mr. Donohue or anyone at DSI know</p> <p>20 about the transfer before the transfer was made?</p> <p>21 A. No.</p> <p>22 Q. And you sent that by email to Mr. Donohue?</p> <p>23 A. Yes.</p> <p>24 Q. Did Mr. Donohue thereafter have any</p> <p>25 discussion with you about that in any way?</p>

Kristin Hendrix - October 27, 2021

<p style="text-align: right;">93</p> <p>1 A. I have no idea.</p> <p>2 Q. He didn't ask what this was for or anything</p> <p>3 like that?</p> <p>4 A. He may have asked what the amount</p> <p>5 represented. I can't specifically recall. But it's</p> <p>6 possible.</p> <p>7 Q. Okay. Do you recall any discussion about</p> <p>8 that time, January 14, with Mr. Donohue or</p> <p>9 Mr. Waterhouse or anyone as to whether that payment</p> <p>10 would in any way relieve NexPoint of the default or</p> <p>11 would not relieve NexPoint of the default?</p> <p>12 A. No.</p> <p>13 Q. Ms. Hendrix, I believe that I am done. I</p> <p>14 would like you, however, because it's important, to</p> <p>15 check your phone. Would you like a short, five-minute</p> <p>16 restroom break and just check --</p> <p>17 A. Yeah, and I might need help figuring out how</p> <p>18 to do that.</p> <p>19 Q. I'm not saying that it's possible, but I'm</p> <p>20 going to ask you on the record to look for that</p> <p>21 November 30 or December 1, 2020 phone call.</p> <p>22 MR. MORRIS: We're happy to do that.</p> <p>23 Q. (BY MR. RUKAVINA) But what I would like if</p> <p>24 you find it, I would like you to tell me the time, the</p> <p>25 date and the length of that call.</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">95</p> <p>1 proceedings today.</p> <p>2 I'm going to try to ask you some questions</p> <p>3 about these adversary proceedings. I'll try to make it</p> <p>4 as quick as possible so we don't keep you here.</p> <p>5 You understand that you're still under oath;</p> <p>6 is that correct?</p> <p>7 A. Correct.</p> <p>8 Q. First topic I want to ask you about is one of</p> <p>9 the defenses in this case related to an oral agreement.</p> <p>10 Let me start off with this question.</p> <p>11 Are you aware that some of the defendants in</p> <p>12 these adversary proceedings have raised a defense that</p> <p>13 there was a subsequent oral agreement allowing the</p> <p>14 notes at issue to be potentially forgiven if certain</p> <p>15 events occurred?</p> <p>16 A. I've recently been made aware that this came</p> <p>17 up, yes.</p> <p>18 Q. When you say recently, approximately when?</p> <p>19 A. Within the last week.</p> <p>20 Q. And where did you learn that from?</p> <p>21 A. In my speakings with John Morris just</p> <p>22 preparing for today.</p> <p>23 MR. AIGEN: And John, I'm going to assume</p> <p>24 that those conversations are privileged?</p> <p>25 MR. MORRIS: That's a very fair assumption.</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">94</p> <p>1 A. Okay.</p> <p>2 Q. Thank you.</p> <p>3 We'll be back in five minutes.</p> <p>4 (Off the record.)</p> <p>5 Q. (BY MR. RUKAVINA) Ms. Hendrix, during the</p> <p>6 break did you look at your phone?</p> <p>7 A. I did.</p> <p>8 Q. Did you find anything?</p> <p>9 A. Sadly, it only goes back to October 5 of</p> <p>10 2021.</p> <p>11 Q. Not surprised. Thank you.</p> <p>12 Have I been courteous to you today?</p> <p>13 A. Yes.</p> <p>14 MR. RUKAVINA: I pass the witness.</p> <p>15 MR. MORRIS: Thank you.</p> <p>16 MR. AIGEN: Are we ready to move forward?</p> <p>17 MR. MORRIS: Yes. You're a little dark</p> <p>18 there.</p> <p>19 MR. RUKAVINA: Can we increase the volume on</p> <p>20 that thing?</p> <p>21 (Off the record.)</p> <p>22 EXAMINATION</p> <p>23 Q. (BY MR. AIGEN) Good afternoon, Ms. Hendrix.</p> <p>24 My name is Michael Aigen. I represent Mr. Dondero,</p> <p>25 HCMS and HCRE Partners in several of the adversary</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">96</p> <p>1 Q. (BY MR. AIGEN) Other than the conversation</p> <p>2 you just referred to with Mr. Morris, have you ever had</p> <p>3 any other conversations with anyone about this alleged</p> <p>4 oral agreement that Defendants are contending occurred?</p> <p>5 A. No.</p> <p>6 Q. So prior to that conversation with Mr. Morris</p> <p>7 you weren't even aware of this alleged defense related</p> <p>8 to an oral agreement. Is that fair to say?</p> <p>9 A. That's right.</p> <p>10 Q. This is a similar question but slightly</p> <p>11 different, just to sort of finish this topic. I'm not</p> <p>12 asking about this oral agreement as a defense, I'm just</p> <p>13 asking more generally.</p> <p>14 Other than this conversation, were you aware</p> <p>15 generally of any conversations that anyone had where</p> <p>16 the notes at issue might be forgiven if certain events</p> <p>17 occurred?</p> <p>18 MR. MORRIS: Objection to the form of the</p> <p>19 question.</p> <p>20 THE WITNESS: No.</p> <p>21 Q. (BY MR. AIGEN) Is it fair to say that you</p> <p>22 haven't had any conversations about this subsequent</p> <p>23 oral agreement with anyone other than Mr. Morris?</p> <p>24 A. That's fair.</p> <p>25 Q. You never discussed it with Mr. Seery?</p>

Kristin Hendrix - October 27, 2021

<p style="text-align: right;">97</p> <p>1 A. No.</p> <p>2 Q. Never discussed it with Mr. Klos?</p> <p>3 A. No. Well, sorry, Mr. Klos was present when</p> <p>4 John and I talked about it. But that's it.</p> <p>5 Q. Have you ever made any investigation or</p> <p>6 effort in order to determine if this oral agreement</p> <p>7 actually occurred?</p> <p>8 A. No.</p> <p>9 Q. If there was such an oral agreement to</p> <p>10 potentially forgive the notes, do you believe that you</p> <p>11 would have known about such an oral agreement as part</p> <p>12 of your duties and responsibilities?</p> <p>13 A. Yes, I would hope so.</p> <p>14 Q. Why do you say that?</p> <p>15 A. That's something that should be disclosed in</p> <p>16 audited financial statements, and me and my team are</p> <p>17 responsible for preparing those financial statements</p> <p>18 and presenting them to the auditors as fair and</p> <p>19 accurate.</p> <p>20 Q. And is it fair to say that this oral</p> <p>21 agreement should have been disclosed to PwC if it was</p> <p>22 determined that it was material?</p> <p>23 A. Yes.</p> <p>24 Q. And have you done any sort of analysis to</p> <p>25 determine whether the oral agreement at issue here</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">99</p> <p>1 A. Yes.</p> <p>2 Q. Can you tell me why?</p> <p>3 A. Sure. It goes along with the same statement</p> <p>4 as HCMFA and NPA and the phone call that I got from</p> <p>5 Frank Waterhouse saying there's no payments coming from</p> <p>6 any of the affiliates to the debtor.</p> <p>7 Q. I may have written that down wrong when you</p> <p>8 talked about that before, but I believe your earlier</p> <p>9 testimony when you described that conversation was that</p> <p>10 there was no more payments coming from the Advisors,</p> <p>11 not affiliates.</p> <p>12 Let me ask you then, what was the</p> <p>13 conversation? Was it no more payments from affiliates</p> <p>14 or Advisors?</p> <p>15 A. It could have been either. I probably did</p> <p>16 say Advisors. But regardless, those payments would</p> <p>17 have been directed to me to be made, either by Frank</p> <p>18 Waterhouse or Jim Dondero.</p> <p>19 And I would assume that nobody directed me to</p> <p>20 make those payments because we weren't making any</p> <p>21 payments from Jim's related parties. I don't know for</p> <p>22 a fact, but that's what I would assume. Those were all</p> <p>23 under the same umbrella.</p> <p>24 Q. And again, let's back up a second.</p> <p>25 When you refer to Advisors, fair to say that</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">98</p> <p>1 would have been material for purposes of a PwC audit?</p> <p>2 A. I've not done any work, just finding out</p> <p>3 about it, but from what it sounds like, it would be</p> <p>4 material.</p> <p>5 Q. That's your opinion, that it would have been</p> <p>6 material; is that fair to say?</p> <p>7 A. Fair.</p> <p>8 Q. Have you had any discussions with anyone else</p> <p>9 about whether the oral agreement would have been</p> <p>10 material?</p> <p>11 A. No.</p> <p>12 Q. Changing topics a little bit here, are you</p> <p>13 aware --</p> <p>14 (Off the record.)</p> <p>15 Q. (BY MR. AIGEN) Are you aware that a few of</p> <p>16 the loans at issue here, specifically related to HCMS</p> <p>17 and HCRE, were term loans as opposed to demand loans?</p> <p>18 A. Yes.</p> <p>19 Q. And are you aware that for those particular</p> <p>20 loans, there were payments that were supposed to be</p> <p>21 made but weren't on December 31, 2020?</p> <p>22 A. Yes.</p> <p>23 Q. Do you have any understanding as to why those</p> <p>24 payments weren't made with respect to the HCMS and HCRE</p> <p>25 term loans on December 31, 2020?</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">100</p> <p>1 that does not include HCMS and HCRE; is that correct?</p> <p>2 A. When I say Advisors, I am referring to HCMFA</p> <p>3 and NPA.</p> <p>4 Q. And when you use the term "affiliates,"</p> <p>5 you're referring to all four; is that correct?</p> <p>6 A. Correct.</p> <p>7 Q. Just want to make sure we're on the same</p> <p>8 page.</p> <p>9 When you answered the previous question you</p> <p>10 started to get into assumptions and things like that.</p> <p>11 Let me start off with what your specific recollection</p> <p>12 of that phone call was. Tell me as best as you can</p> <p>13 what you remember Frank telling you?</p> <p>14 A. I remember it as being no payments from the</p> <p>15 Advisors to the debtor.</p> <p>16 Q. So you don't remember the instruction being,</p> <p>17 don't make payments from the affiliates. It was, don't</p> <p>18 make payments from the Advisors; is that correct?</p> <p>19 A. Correct.</p> <p>20 Q. So is it fair to say that you don't remember</p> <p>21 any instructions telling you not to make any payments</p> <p>22 from HCMS or HCRE?</p> <p>23 A. That's fair.</p> <p>24 Q. So if that is the case, why weren't payments</p> <p>25 made from HCMS or HCRE for December 31, 2020, payment?</p>

Kristin Hendrix - October 27, 2021

<p style="text-align: right;">101</p> <p>1 A. Sure. Typically what would have happened is</p> <p>2 Frank would be talking to Jim Dondero about making</p> <p>3 these payments and getting his approval to do so,</p> <p>4 because Jim Dondero is, you know, directing payments</p> <p>5 out of these entities.</p> <p>6 I have never -- had never been given the</p> <p>7 direction to effectuate those payments by anybody.</p> <p>8 Q. Is it fair to say, then, that you're not</p> <p>9 aware of any instructions from anyone saying that the</p> <p>10 HCMS and HCRE payments should not be made on</p> <p>11 December 31, 2020?</p> <p>12 A. That's fair.</p> <p>13 Q. So the reason the payments weren't made is</p> <p>14 because you never got an affirmative instruction to</p> <p>15 actually make that payment; is that correct?</p> <p>16 A. Correct.</p> <p>17 Q. And you're not aware of Mr. Dondero</p> <p>18 instructing anyone that HCMS and HCRE should not have</p> <p>19 made the December 31, 2020, payments; is that correct?</p> <p>20 A. I'm not aware personally, no. Correct.</p> <p>21 Q. You say personally. In any way are you aware</p> <p>22 of such a specific instruction?</p> <p>23 A. No.</p> <p>24 Q. If that payment was to be made, who at the</p> <p>25 debtor would have been responsible for making those</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">103</p> <p>1 Q. And is that because it's only your job to</p> <p>2 make payments that you're told to specifically make; is</p> <p>3 that correct?</p> <p>4 A. Yes, in this case, that is correct.</p> <p>5 Q. Is it fair to say then that as part of your</p> <p>6 job responsibilities you've never made a payment to</p> <p>7 anyone without being specifically told by Mr. Dondero</p> <p>8 and Mr. Waterhouse?</p> <p>9 A. Sorry, say that again.</p> <p>10 Q. As part of your job responsibilities, have</p> <p>11 you ever made a payment to anyone without the specific</p> <p>12 instruction of Mr. Waterhouse or Mr. Dondero?</p> <p>13 MR. MORRIS: Objection to the form of the</p> <p>14 question.</p> <p>15 THE WITNESS: Yes, we make payments all the</p> <p>16 time.</p> <p>17 Q. (BY MR. AIGEN) So why is this different in</p> <p>18 that this payment was not made without the specific</p> <p>19 instructions from Mr. Waterhouse and Mr. Dondero, even</p> <p>20 though you believed the payment was due on December 31,</p> <p>21 2020?</p> <p>22 A. The difference between making a loan payment</p> <p>23 and making normal course -- or sorry, normal, ordinary</p> <p>24 course, you know, overhead expense payments is that</p> <p>25 something like that is not necessarily what we would</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">102</p> <p>1 payments on behalf of HCMS and HCRE?</p> <p>2 MR. MORRIS: Objection to the form of the</p> <p>3 question.</p> <p>4 THE WITNESS: The corporate accounting team.</p> <p>5 Q. (BY MR. AIGEN) And that included you?</p> <p>6 A. Yes.</p> <p>7 Q. And in December of 2020, were you aware that</p> <p>8 those payments were due on December 31, 2020?</p> <p>9 A. Yes.</p> <p>10 Q. Did you make any attempts or efforts to</p> <p>11 determine whether Mr. Dondero wanted those payments to</p> <p>12 be made?</p> <p>13 A. I did not, no.</p> <p>14 Q. Why not?</p> <p>15 A. That would have been something that Frank</p> <p>16 Waterhouse would have done directly with Jim Dondero</p> <p>17 himself.</p> <p>18 Q. Did you have any conversations with anyone</p> <p>19 about whether the December 31 payments for HCMS and</p> <p>20 HCRE would be made in December of 2020?</p> <p>21 A. Not that I can recall.</p> <p>22 Q. And you didn't think it was your</p> <p>23 responsibility to check on those payments and find out</p> <p>24 if they should have been made?</p> <p>25 A. Right, correct.</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">104</p> <p>1 take to Jim Dondero to approve.</p> <p>2 He doesn't have time to approve every single</p> <p>3 overhead payment that we're making out of every single</p> <p>4 entity. That's what Frank is for.</p> <p>5 Something that's once a year that's more</p> <p>6 material in amount, such as a loan payment, that is</p> <p>7 something that needs to get approved by Jim Dondero.</p> <p>8 Q. You say needs to get approved. What's your</p> <p>9 basis for that, something in a policy manual, something</p> <p>10 someone told you?</p> <p>11 A. It's a policy that my team followed. I don't</p> <p>12 think that it's written in an actual manual anywhere,</p> <p>13 but anything that's not ordinary course needs to get</p> <p>14 approved by Jim Dondero.</p> <p>15 Q. Is that something that's written in a policy</p> <p>16 anywhere?</p> <p>17 A. Not that I know of.</p> <p>18 Q. Were you ever told that payments in the</p> <p>19 ordinary course can be made without Mr. Dondero's</p> <p>20 approval but loan payments cannot?</p> <p>21 A. Yes, I do recall years ago that Frank and I,</p> <p>22 possibly Jim, this was years ago, had a conversation</p> <p>23 that anything ordinary course is up to Frank to</p> <p>24 approve. And this is, quite frankly, up to Frank.</p> <p>25 Whatever he felt Jim needed to sign off on,</p>

Kristin Hendrix - October 27, 2021

<p style="text-align: right;">105</p> <p>1 that's what Jim would sign off on. This was not my 2 responsibility to make that decision. 3 Q. And in December -- prior to the December 31, 4 2020, due date you didn't have any conversations with 5 anyone about whether this -- these payments that were 6 due should be made; is that correct? 7 A. Correct. 8 Q. And you didn't try to check with anyone to 9 see whether anyone wanted these payments to be made; is 10 that correct? 11 A. Correct. 12 Q. Subsequent to the payment being missed, did 13 you ever have any conversations with anyone about why 14 the payment was not made? 15 A. Not that I recall. 16 Q. So is it fair to say that sitting here today 17 you have no idea why the payments were not made for 18 HCMS and HCRE on December 31, 2020? 19 MR. MORRIS: Objection to the form of the 20 question. 21 THE WITNESS: I don't have any specific 22 evidence telling me why they weren't. I can make 23 assumptions but that's not going to help. 24 Q. (BY MR. AIGEN) Well, did you ever have any 25 conversations with anyone about why those payments were</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">107</p> <p>1 A. I can't tell you the exact date, but, yes, I 2 do have a recollection of Frank calling or emailing me 3 to have, I believe it was the HCRE wire sent out for 4 their payment. 5 Q. What about the HCMS payment? 6 A. I don't recall that one as much. 7 Q. Other than the payment being made, do you 8 have any recollection of any other conversations about 9 why the payment was being made? 10 A. No. 11 Q. Are you aware of any conversations that 12 anyone had regarding whether these payments would 13 deaccelerate loans? 14 A. No. 15 Q. Is that something you would normally be part 16 of, conversations like that? 17 A. No. 18 Q. Changing topics here. Not sure if this is an 19 area that you know anything about. 20 Are you familiar with the term, as it's used 21 at Highland, NAV ratio trigger period? 22 A. No. 23 Q. This may go very quick. If I represent to 24 you that it's a term that's used in the -- in the 25 fourth amended limited partnership agreement for</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">106</p> <p>1 not made? 2 A. No. 3 Q. You have no idea why they weren't made other 4 than just speculation; is that fair to say? 5 A. Correct. 6 MR. MORRIS: Objection. Asked and answered. 7 THE WITNESS: Correct. 8 Q. (BY MR. AIGEN) And are you aware that with 9 respect to those two loans, some payments were actually 10 made in the next month, in January of 2021? 11 A. Yes. 12 Q. What role, if any, did you have with respect 13 to those payments? 14 A. Frank Waterhouse would call me and tell me to 15 have my team effectuate a wire. 16 Q. And you say would call you. Do you remember 17 this conversation or are you just assuming it occurred? 18 MR. MORRIS: Objection to the form of the 19 question. 20 THE WITNESS: If we sent a payment out, Frank 21 would have told me to do it. I would not have done it 22 on my own. 23 Q. (BY MR. AIGEN) Sitting here today, do you 24 have a specific recollection of the conversation where 25 someone told you to make the January 2021 payments?</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">108</p> <p>1 Highland Capital Management, would that refresh your 2 recollection at all? 3 A. No. 4 Q. Fair to say, then, that you have no knowledge 5 as to whether NAV ratio trigger period was ever reached 6 at any time prior to bankruptcy buyouts? 7 A. No, I don't know. 8 Q. Have you ever had any conversations with 9 Nancy Dondero? 10 A. I have not. 11 Q. Never met her? 12 A. No. I may have exchanged an email with her 13 on an invoice, but that's the extent of it. No 14 conversations. 15 Q. In the years leading up to the bankruptcy of 16 Highland Capital, was there any time period where 17 Highland was unable to pay its salaries? 18 A. Salaries? 19 Q. Salaries of its employees? 20 A. No. 21 Q. In the time leading up to the Highland 22 bankruptcy, was there any time period where Highland 23 wasn't able to pay bonuses owed to any of its 24 employees? 25 A. Not that I know of. Not that I can recall.</p>

Kristin Hendrix - October 27, 2021

<p style="text-align: right;">109</p> <p>1 Q. Are you aware of any time period leading up 2 to the Highland bankruptcy where Highland was unable to 3 pay its bills? 4 A. There's times where we would be in a cash 5 flow crunch and we would stretch our AP, but eventually 6 it would get paid. 7 Q. And I think this is the last topic and we can 8 probably move through this pretty quickly. 9 Are you aware of any loans made by Highland 10 to any of its employees or officers that were forgiven 11 in part or all? 12 A. Yes. 13 Q. Which officers or employees are you aware of? 14 A. I recall there were two employees. I can't 15 remember one of them, but I believe another, the second 16 one, was Paul Adkins. Again, I'm just recalling this 17 was years ago. 18 Q. And these two are the only ones you're aware 19 of? 20 A. Or I'm sorry, not Paul Adkins, Tim Lawler. 21 It's possible Paul Adkins was the other one, but I 22 can't tell you for sure. 23 Q. Tim Lawler and some other employee that you 24 can't remember the name of are the only two that you're 25 aware of?</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">111</p> <p>1 behalf of HCMFA in May of 2019 to bind HCMFA to such 2 notes? 3 A. No. 4 Q. Thank you, ma'am. 5 EXAMINATION 6 Q. (BY MR. MORRIS) Ms. Hendrix, can you get out 7 of your pile, Exhibit Number 3. 8 And this is the email from Dave Klos to 9 corporate accounting on May 2nd concerning the 10 \$2.4 million that was going to be transferred from 11 HCMLP to HCMFA? 12 A. Yes. 13 Q. And how did Mr. Klos characterize that 14 transfer? 15 A. He called it a new intercompany loan. 16 Q. What does a new intercompany loan mean to 17 you? 18 A. That means we are creating a new loan 19 document, sending money out, tracking it as a 20 brand-new, fresh loan. 21 Q. And he sent this email to an email group 22 called corporateaccounting@hcmlp.com. Do I have that 23 right? 24 A. Yes. 25 Q. Were you included in that email group?</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">110</p> <p>1 A. Yes. 2 Q. This other employee, I know you don't 3 remember the name. Is there any other description that 4 you can give me, what their position was, how long they 5 worked, or is it just you remember those loans? 6 A. I just remember we had two employee loans. 7 Q. Approximately when was this? 8 A. I couldn't even tell you. All the years just 9 commingle together. 10 Q. More than five years ago? 11 A. Yes. 12 Q. More than 10 years ago? 13 A. I couldn't say. 14 MR. AIGEN: Why don't we take a five-minute 15 break and then I'll either be done or have just a few 16 wrap-up questions. 17 MR. RUKAVINA: Okay. 18 (Off the record.) 19 FURTHER EXAMINATION 20 Q. (BY MR. RUKAVINA) Ms. Hendrix, in May of 21 2019, would you on behalf of Highland alone, 22 unilaterally, have the authority to lend to HCMFA 2.4- 23 and/or \$5.0 million? 24 A. No. 25 Q. And would you have had any authority on</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">112</p> <p>1 A. I was. 2 Q. Can you identify everybody else who you 3 recall being in that email group? 4 A. Yes. 5 Q. Who else was in that email group? 6 A. Dave Klos, Frank Waterhouse, myself, Hayley 7 Eliason, and Blair Roeber. 8 Q. Okay. Did Mr. Waterhouse ever tell anybody, 9 to the best of your knowledge, in May 2019 that the 10 transaction should not be booked as a loan? 11 A. No, not to my knowledge. 12 Q. You testified earlier that there was, you 13 recall, a similar email the next day with respect to a 14 \$5 million transaction. 15 Do you recall that? 16 A. Yes. 17 Q. Do you recall if that email also went to 18 corporate accounting? 19 A. I believe so, yes. 20 Q. And to the best of your knowledge, would 21 Mr. Waterhouse have been informed on May 3, 2019, that 22 the transaction was being booked by the corporate 23 accounting department as a loan? 24 A. Yes. 25 Q. Did Mr. Waterhouse tell you at that time or</p>

Kristin Hendrix - October 27, 2021

<p style="text-align: right;">113</p> <p>1 at any time thereafter that it was a mistake to book it 2 as a loan? 3 A. No. 4 Q. Did Mr. Waterhouse tell you at that time or 5 at any time thereafter that he didn't intend to sign 6 the promissory notes? 7 A. No. 8 MR. RUKAVINA: Objection. To the last 9 question, objection to form. 10 Go ahead. 11 Q. (BY MR. MORRIS) Okay. The promissory notes, 12 to be clear, are the two promissory notes that you 13 testified to earlier that have been marked as exhibits 14 in this deposition for \$5 million and \$2.4 million 15 respectively. 16 With that definition as promissory notes, did 17 Mr. Waterhouse ever tell you at any time that it was a 18 mistake to sign those notes? 19 MR. RUKAVINA: I'll object to the form. 20 Go ahead. 21 THE WITNESS: No. 22 Q. (BY MR. MORRIS) Did Mr. Waterhouse or 23 anybody -- withdrawn. I'll go back to the first 24 question. 25 Did Mr. Waterhouse or anybody in the world</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">115</p> <p>1 HCMFA. I oversaw all other aspects of the audit my 2 team carried out. 3 Any requests from the auditors, emails with 4 questions, any issues that arose, all of that went 5 through me. 6 Q. And did Mr. Waterhouse play a role in 7 relation to the annual audit? 8 A. Yes. 9 Q. What is your understanding of 10 Mr. Waterhouse's role? 11 A. Let's see. He was in charge of reviewing the 12 financial statements as they were done, so he saw the 13 end product. He would sign off on the management rep 14 letter. He signed engagement letters. 15 If there were any big issues, those got -- 16 those would be brought to Frank's attention for sure. 17 Q. Okay. And are you a CPA? 18 A. Yes. 19 Q. And are you familiar with management rep 20 letters? 21 A. Yes. 22 Q. What is your understanding of what a 23 management rep letter is? 24 A. That's basically telling the auditors that 25 everything in the audited financial report is accurate</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">114</p> <p>1 ever tell you at any time since May of 2019 that it was 2 a mistake to issue the promissory notes as we've 3 defined them? 4 A. No. 5 Q. Did Mr. Waterhouse or anybody in the world 6 tell you that Mr. Waterhouse wasn't authorized to affix 7 his signature to those promissory notes? 8 MR. RUKAVINA: And I'll object. Assumes 9 facts not in evidence, i.e., the signature. That's 10 what I've been objecting to. 11 But go ahead and answer. 12 THE WITNESS: Say it again. 13 Q. (BY MR. MORRIS) Did Mr. Waterhouse or 14 anybody in the world tell you at any time that he 15 wasn't authorized to have his signature affixed to the 16 promissory notes? 17 MR. RUKAVINA: Same objection. 18 THE WITNESS: No. 19 Q. (BY MR. MORRIS) Did you have anything to do 20 with Highland's annual audit? 21 A. Yes. 22 Q. What role did you play with respect to 23 Highland's annual audit? 24 A. I personally was in charge of completely 25 writing the entire audit report for the debtor and for</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">116</p> <p>1 to the best of their knowledge, they've presented 2 everything that they have fair and accurately, they're 3 not withholding any information. 4 Q. And do you recall that the -- Highland's 2018 5 audit was completed in early June 2019? 6 A. Yes. 7 Q. And did you cause the two promissory notes 8 that we're talking about here to be delivered to 9 PricewaterhouseCoopers in connection with the audit? 10 A. Yes. 11 Q. And were those two promissory notes delivered 12 to PricewaterhouseCoopers because they constituted 13 subsequent events? 14 A. Yes. 15 Q. Do you recall whether those promissory notes 16 were described in Highland's 2018 audited financial 17 statements? 18 A. Yes. 19 Q. And did Mr. Waterhouse or Mr. Dondero ever 20 tell you at any time that there was a mistake in the 21 audited financial statements? 22 A. No. 23 Q. Did they ever tell you -- did Mr. Waterhouse 24 or Mr. Dondero or anybody in the world ever tell you at 25 any time that the two notes were mischaracterized in</p>

Kristin Hendrix - October 27, 2021

<p style="text-align: right;">117</p> <p>1 the 2018 audited financial statements of Highland 2 Capital? 3 A. No. 4 Q. Do you know whether HCMFA also had its annual 5 financial statements audited by PricewaterhouseCoopers? 6 A. Yes. 7 Q. Did you play any role in connection with that 8 audit? 9 A. Yes. 10 Q. What role did you play in connection with 11 HCMFA's audit of the 2018 financial statements? 12 A. Same exact role as with the debtors -- 13 Q. And -- 14 A. -- writing the audit report, overseeing all 15 other audit functions. 16 Q. And did you and your group cause HCMFA to 17 deliver to PricewaterhouseCoopers the two promissory 18 notes that we've been discussing from May 2019? 19 A. Yes. 20 Q. Did Mr. Waterhouse or Mr. Dondero or anybody 21 in the world ever tell you that it was a mistake to 22 deliver those promissory notes to PwC in connection 23 with HCMFA's 2018 audit? 24 A. No. 25 Q. Were those notes delivered -- withdrawn.</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">119</p> <p>1 reference to these notes in HCMFA's 2018 audited 2 financial statements? 3 MR. RUKAVINA: Same objection. 4 THE WITNESS: No. 5 Q. (BY MR. MORRIS) Okay. Do you recall, did 6 anybody in the world ever tell you that the 7 transactions described in Exhibit 3 and the other 8 document that you recall should never have been booked 9 as a loan? 10 A. No. 11 Q. Did anybody in the world tell you that you 12 made a mistake when you created those promissory notes? 13 A. No. 14 Q. Can you pull out what was marked as 15 Exhibit 16. 16 Do you understand that the Advisors provide 17 services to certain retail funds? 18 A. Yes. 19 Q. And do you recall that the services are 20 subject to an agreement that's subject to annual 21 review? 22 A. Yes. 23 Q. So looking at Exhibit 16, did you understand 24 that the retail board had asked Highland to disclose -- 25 I'll just read it from the document on page 2,</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">118</p> <p>1 Were those notes delivered to 2 PricewaterhouseCoopers because they constituted 3 subsequent events in connection with the 2018 audit? 4 A. Yes. 5 Q. Do you recall whether PricewaterhouseCoopers 6 included as a liability on HCMFA's balance sheet the 7 obligations reflected in the two promissory notes at 8 issue? 9 MR. RUKAVINA: Objection. Best evidence. 10 Answer. 11 THE WITNESS: On the 2018 financials? 12 Q. (BY MR. MORRIS) Correct. 13 A. Those would not have been included as 14 liabilities in the 2018 financials. 15 Q. Do you know if HCMFA completed their audit 16 for 2019? 17 A. No. 18 Q. Okay. Did the notes appear in HCMFA's 2018 19 audited financials under the subsequent events section? 20 A. Yes. 21 MR. RUKAVINA: Objection. Best evidence. 22 Go ahead. 23 Q. (BY MR. MORRIS) Did Mr. Dondero or -- did 24 Mr. Waterhouse or Mr. Dondero or anybody in the world 25 ever tell you that it was a mistake to include</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">120</p> <p>1 Bates number ending 881. 2 There's an email from Ms. Thedford that says, 3 quote, are there any material amounts -- withdrawn. 4 Are there any material outstanding amounts 5 currently payable or due in the future, open paren, 6 e.g., notes, close paren, to HCMLP by HCMFA or NexPoint 7 Advisors or any other affiliate that provides services 8 to the funds? 9 Do you see that? 10 A. Yes. 11 Q. And were you generally aware that that was 12 part of the annual renewal process? 13 A. Yes. 14 Q. And you made some comments earlier about 15 Ms. Thedford's response on the first page. 16 Do you recall that? 17 A. Yes. 18 Q. And you actually were able to correct certain 19 mistakes that you perceived in her response. 20 Do I have that right? 21 A. Correct. 22 Q. Do you know -- do you see where it says, 23 HCMFA due to HCMLP as of June 30, 2020, let's just call 24 it \$12.3 million. 25 Do you see that?</p>

Kristin Hendrix - October 27, 2021

<p style="text-align: right;">121</p> <p>1 A. Yes.</p> <p>2 Q. And above that there is a reference to the</p> <p>3 6/30 financials.</p> <p>4 Do you see that?</p> <p>5 A. I do.</p> <p>6 Q. Do you know what the reference to the 6/30</p> <p>7 financials is?</p> <p>8 A. Yes.</p> <p>9 Q. And what is that reference?</p> <p>10 A. That is referencing the amounts on the</p> <p>11 balance sheet at 6/30 that we provided for the 15(c)</p> <p>12 materials to the board.</p> <p>13 Q. Okay. And does that \$12.3 million include,</p> <p>14 to the best of your knowledge, the principal amount of</p> <p>15 the two notes that we were talking about?</p> <p>16 A. Yes.</p> <p>17 MR. RUKAVINA: Objection. Best evidence.</p> <p>18 THE WITNESS: Yes.</p> <p>19 Q. (BY MR. MORRIS) And how do you know that?</p> <p>20 A. Because I kept their financials, I know for a</p> <p>21 fact that it included all of their outstanding notes</p> <p>22 and it most certainly included these two notes that</p> <p>23 we've been talking about today.</p> <p>24 Q. And to the best of your recollection did</p> <p>25 HCMFA provide the 6/30 financials to the retail board?</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">123</p> <p>1 was given to the retail board?</p> <p>2 A. I likely did. I can't tell you for certain</p> <p>3 that I was on the correspondence.</p> <p>4 Q. Do you recall any discussion at any time that</p> <p>5 the \$12.3 million number in Ms. Thedford's email should</p> <p>6 be changed in the final report to the retail board?</p> <p>7 A. I don't believe so.</p> <p>8 Q. Did anybody ever tell you at any time that</p> <p>9 the \$12.3 million number was incorrect?</p> <p>10 A. No.</p> <p>11 Q. Did anybody ever tell you at any time that</p> <p>12 that number wrongly included the \$7.4 million reflected</p> <p>13 in the two notes?</p> <p>14 A. No.</p> <p>15 Q. Okay. Do you recall that earlier that</p> <p>16 summer -- we looked at Exhibit 15?</p> <p>17 A. Yep.</p> <p>18 Q. And that was an attachment to an email that</p> <p>19 you personally sent to Mr. Dondero. We saw that</p> <p>20 before?</p> <p>21 A. Right.</p> <p>22 Q. And this Exhibit 15, which was attached to</p> <p>23 your email, identifies amounts due and owing from</p> <p>24 NexPoint Advisors; right?</p> <p>25 A. Right.</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">122</p> <p>1 A. Yes.</p> <p>2 Q. And to the best of your knowledge did</p> <p>3 Mr. Dondero or Mr. Waterhouse or anybody in the world</p> <p>4 ever tell you that the financial statements that were</p> <p>5 provided to the retail board were erroneous in any way?</p> <p>6 A. No.</p> <p>7 Q. Did Mr. Dondero or Mr. Waterhouse or anybody</p> <p>8 in the world ever tell you that the 6/30 financials</p> <p>9 that were given to the retail board should not have</p> <p>10 included the \$7.4 million principal amount on the two</p> <p>11 promissory notes?</p> <p>12 MR. RUKAVINA: Objection. Best evidence.</p> <p>13 Answer.</p> <p>14 THE WITNESS: No.</p> <p>15 Q. (BY MR. MORRIS) Do you know whether -- are</p> <p>16 you at all familiar with the Advisors' actual response</p> <p>17 to the retail board in October 2020?</p> <p>18 A. Say that again, please.</p> <p>19 Q. So this email string is October 2020; right?</p> <p>20 A. Right.</p> <p>21 Q. And do you understand that this is kind of a</p> <p>22 discussion between Mr. Waterhouse and Ms. Thedford as</p> <p>23 to how to respond?</p> <p>24 A. Yes.</p> <p>25 Q. Have you ever seen the actual response that</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">124</p> <p>1 Q. And it identifies amounts due and owing for a</p> <p>2 number of different entities, including HCMFA; right?</p> <p>3 A. Correct.</p> <p>4 Q. Do you know whether the amount included for</p> <p>5 HCMFA on Exhibit 15 included the principal amount due</p> <p>6 on the two promissory notes?</p> <p>7 A. It does.</p> <p>8 Q. Did Mr. Dondero or Mr. Waterhouse ever ask</p> <p>9 you why -- withdrawn.</p> <p>10 Did Mr. Dondero or Mr. Waterhouse ever ask</p> <p>11 you how the \$10.5 million number was calculated?</p> <p>12 A. No.</p> <p>13 Q. Did Mr. Dondero or Mr. Waterhouse ever</p> <p>14 suggest to you that the number was incorrect?</p> <p>15 A. No.</p> <p>16 Q. Did Mr. Dondero or Mr. Waterhouse or anybody</p> <p>17 in the world ever question the number that you gave to</p> <p>18 Mr. Dondero in the summer of 2020 concerning the</p> <p>19 principal amount due by HCMFA to HCMLP?</p> <p>20 A. No.</p> <p>21 Q. Have you ever made a payment -- withdrawn.</p> <p>22 Have you ever caused a payment to be made in</p> <p>23 connection with an intercompany loan without receiving</p> <p>24 the prior approval from either Frank Waterhouse or</p> <p>25 Mr. Dondero?</p>

Kristin Hendrix - October 27, 2021

<p style="text-align: right;">125</p> <p>1 A. No.</p> <p>2 Q. Has anybody ever said to you that you made a</p> <p>3 mistake in applying a payment against principal or</p> <p>4 interest due on an intercompany loan?</p> <p>5 A. No.</p> <p>6 Q. We saw this morning, and we produced to</p> <p>7 Mr. Rukavina and he mentioned earlier, 13-week</p> <p>8 forecasts? Do you understand that?</p> <p>9 A. Yes.</p> <p>10 Q. Did you review the 13-week forecasts</p> <p>11 recently?</p> <p>12 A. Yes.</p> <p>13 Q. And we're talking specifically about the</p> <p>14 13-week forecasts for the November/December 2020 time</p> <p>15 period. Do you understand that?</p> <p>16 A. Yes.</p> <p>17 Q. Based on your review of those forecasts, did</p> <p>18 those forecasts specifically identify the principal and</p> <p>19 interest that were due on the three term notes as of</p> <p>20 December 28, 2020?</p> <p>21 A. Yes.</p> <p>22 Q. And what was the purpose of creating the</p> <p>23 13-week forecasts?</p> <p>24 A. Sure. That was to keep everybody informed</p> <p>25 who was on the cash call, Frank Waterhouse, Jim Seery</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">127</p> <p>1 A. Yes.</p> <p>2 Q. And was that information that was included on</p> <p>3 the reports to Mr. Waterhouse?</p> <p>4 A. Yes.</p> <p>5 Q. And do you recall whether there were any</p> <p>6 specific discussions in November or December of 2020</p> <p>7 concerning those payments -- withdrawn. That wasn't a</p> <p>8 good question.</p> <p>9 Did Mr. Waterhouse or -- withdrawn.</p> <p>10 Did anybody on behalf of HCMS or HCRE ever</p> <p>11 instruct you to make the payments that were due under</p> <p>12 their term notes?</p> <p>13 A. No.</p> <p>14 Q. Did anybody on behalf of NexPoint ever</p> <p>15 instruct you to make a payment that was due at year end</p> <p>16 with respect to the NexPoint term note?</p> <p>17 A. No.</p> <p>18 Q. Were you authorized to make those payments</p> <p>19 without the prior approval of either Mr. Waterhouse or</p> <p>20 Mr. Dondero?</p> <p>21 A. No.</p> <p>22 Q. I think you testified that there were certain</p> <p>23 payments that were made in January 2001 under each of</p> <p>24 the three term notes.</p> <p>25 Do I have that right?</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">126</p> <p>1 and others, keep everybody informed of upcoming</p> <p>2 payments that were due on term loans well in advance.</p> <p>3 Everybody knew about it. It was out there</p> <p>4 for everybody to see that was on these cash calls.</p> <p>5 Q. Now, is it your understanding that</p> <p>6 Mr. Waterhouse -- withdrawn.</p> <p>7 Did you email these forecasts -- withdrawn.</p> <p>8 Did anybody email these forecasts to the best</p> <p>9 of your recollection in late 2020?</p> <p>10 A. Yes.</p> <p>11 Q. And was it sent to the corporate accounting</p> <p>12 group that we saw earlier?</p> <p>13 A. It was probably sent to Frank, Seery, the DSI</p> <p>14 guys that were involved with the cash call.</p> <p>15 Q. Okay. And so did you participate in the</p> <p>16 creation of the 13-week forecasts?</p> <p>17 A. Yes.</p> <p>18 Q. What role did you play in the creation of the</p> <p>19 13-week forecasts?</p> <p>20 A. I was responsible for creating the entire</p> <p>21 thing.</p> <p>22 Q. Okay. And based on the work that you did,</p> <p>23 was one of the purposes to make sure that</p> <p>24 Mr. Waterhouse was aware of all payments that were</p> <p>25 coming due under the intercompany notes?</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">128</p> <p>1 A. Correct.</p> <p>2 MR. RUKAVINA: 2021.</p> <p>3 MR. MORRIS: Thank you very much.</p> <p>4 Q. (BY MR. MORRIS) With that amendment, do you</p> <p>5 understand my question?</p> <p>6 A. Yes.</p> <p>7 Q. Do you know why the three payments were made</p> <p>8 in January of 2021 on each of three term notes?</p> <p>9 A. Because Frank Waterhouse instructed me to do</p> <p>10 so.</p> <p>11 Q. And he had not instructed you to make those</p> <p>12 payments prior to that time?</p> <p>13 A. Correct.</p> <p>14 Q. Did you have to prompt Frank Waterhouse in</p> <p>15 January of 2021 to make those payments?</p> <p>16 A. No.</p> <p>17 Q. So based on the 13-week forecast that you</p> <p>18 prepared and delivered to Mr. Waterhouse, is it your</p> <p>19 understanding that Mr. Waterhouse knew as early as mid</p> <p>20 November 2020 that payments would be due under the</p> <p>21 three term notes at the end of the year?</p> <p>22 A. Yes.</p> <p>23 Q. And, in fact, did HCMS and HCRE and NexPoint</p> <p>24 timely make their installment payments that were due at</p> <p>25 year end 2018?</p>

Kristin Hendrix - October 27, 2021

<p style="text-align: right;">129</p> <p>1 A. Yes.</p> <p>2 Q. And was that done because HCMLP received the</p> <p>3 instructions of somebody authorized to give the</p> <p>4 instruction on behalf of those entities?</p> <p>5 A. Yes.</p> <p>6 Q. Did HCMS and HCRE and NexPoint timely make</p> <p>7 the installment payments that were due at year end</p> <p>8 2019?</p> <p>9 A. Yes.</p> <p>10 Q. And why did they make those payments?</p> <p>11 A. Because we were provided instruction and</p> <p>12 authorization to do so.</p> <p>13 Q. Okay. And is the only reason that the</p> <p>14 payment wasn't made at year end 2020 because nobody on</p> <p>15 behalf of the Advisors -- withdrawn.</p> <p>16 Is the only reason that no payment was made</p> <p>17 at the end of 2020 is because no one on behalf of</p> <p>18 NexPoint, HCRE, or HCMS directed HCMLP to make those</p> <p>19 payments?</p> <p>20 A. Correct.</p> <p>21 MR. AIGEN: Objection. Form.</p> <p>22 Q. (BY MR. MORRIS) And you testified earlier to</p> <p>23 a call that you had with Mr. Waterhouse. I think you</p> <p>24 said it was either November 30 or December 1.</p> <p>25 Do you recall that?</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">131</p> <p>1 any reason they weren't, then they were going to raise</p> <p>2 an issue, a going concern issue.</p> <p>3 That came up several years in a row with</p> <p>4 HCMFA.</p> <p>5 Q. Do you recall that the three term notes at</p> <p>6 issue here were all signed on May 31, 2017?</p> <p>7 A. Yes.</p> <p>8 Q. And all of those term notes involved a</p> <p>9 roll-up of previously issued demand notes; is that</p> <p>10 right?</p> <p>11 A. Correct.</p> <p>12 Q. Do you know why in -- at the end of May 2017</p> <p>13 NexPoint, HCRE, and HCMS rolled up their demand notes</p> <p>14 into individualized term notes?</p> <p>15 A. Yes.</p> <p>16 Q. What is your understanding as to why that</p> <p>17 happened?</p> <p>18 A. That would get the auditors a little bit more</p> <p>19 comfort over our outstanding loans, ensuring that we</p> <p>20 have an amortization schedule, an underlying contract,</p> <p>21 showing that payments will be coming in every year on</p> <p>22 these outstanding receivables.</p> <p>23 Q. Okay. As the person responsible for</p> <p>24 preparing Highland's audit, did anybody ever tell you</p> <p>25 at any time that any of the notes were not valid</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">130</p> <p>1 A. Yes.</p> <p>2 Q. And did you personally continue to prepare</p> <p>3 the 13-week forecasts after your conversation with</p> <p>4 Mr. Waterhouse?</p> <p>5 A. Yes.</p> <p>6 Q. And did those 13-week forecasts continue to</p> <p>7 include the payments that were due under the three term</p> <p>8 notes at the year end?</p> <p>9 A. Yes.</p> <p>10 Q. And that's information that you gave to</p> <p>11 Mr. Waterhouse; is that right?</p> <p>12 A. Right.</p> <p>13 Q. Mr. Rukavina elicited from you the fact that</p> <p>14 payments of principal hadn't been made on demand notes</p> <p>15 that were executed in favor of Mr. Dondero's</p> <p>16 affiliates.</p> <p>17 Do you recall that?</p> <p>18 A. Yes.</p> <p>19 Q. Okay. Was that a topic of conversation with</p> <p>20 PricewaterhouseCoopers at any time?</p> <p>21 A. Yes.</p> <p>22 Q. Can you tell me about that conversation?</p> <p>23 A. Sure. As part of our annual audit, the</p> <p>24 auditors would, you know, make sure that our</p> <p>25 receivables are collectible. And if they thought for</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">132</p> <p>1 obligations of the maker?</p> <p>2 A. No.</p> <p>3 Q. As the person responsible for Highland's</p> <p>4 audit, did anybody ever tell you at any time that any</p> <p>5 of the notes at issue should not have been signed?</p> <p>6 A. No.</p> <p>7 Q. As the person responsible for Highland's</p> <p>8 audit, did anybody ever tell you at any time that any</p> <p>9 of the notes at issue were signed by mistake?</p> <p>10 A. No.</p> <p>11 Q. Did anybody ever tell you at any time that --</p> <p>12 withdrawn.</p> <p>13 As the person responsible for Highland's</p> <p>14 audit, did anybody ever tell you at any time that</p> <p>15 Mr. Dondero didn't approve of any of the notes?</p> <p>16 A. No.</p> <p>17 Q. As the person responsible for Highland's</p> <p>18 audit, did anybody ever tell you at any time that</p> <p>19 the -- any of the notes at issue were subject to an</p> <p>20 oral agreement?</p> <p>21 A. No.</p> <p>22 Q. As the person responsible for Highland's</p> <p>23 audit, did anybody ever tell you at any time that any</p> <p>24 of the notes were amended?</p> <p>25 A. No.</p>

Kristin Hendrix - October 27, 2021

<p style="text-align: right;">133</p> <p>1 Q. As the person responsible for Highland's</p> <p>2 audit, did anybody ever tell you at any time that any</p> <p>3 of the notes would be forgiven?</p> <p>4 A. No.</p> <p>5 Q. During your 15 years at Highland, has an</p> <p>6 intercompany loan ever been forgiven in whole or in</p> <p>7 part?</p> <p>8 A. No.</p> <p>9 Q. During your -- withdrawn.</p> <p>10 Can you recall any note that Highland ever</p> <p>11 held as the payee that was forgiven in whole or in part</p> <p>12 in the five years prior to bankruptcy, go back to 2014?</p> <p>13 A. No.</p> <p>14 Q. Is it your understanding as the person</p> <p>15 responsible for Highland's audit that the forgiveness</p> <p>16 of notes, if they were in a material amount, would have</p> <p>17 had to have been disclosed in the audited financial</p> <p>18 statements?</p> <p>19 A. Yes.</p> <p>20 Q. So is it fair to say that any evidence of the</p> <p>21 forgiveness of material amounts would have been</p> <p>22 disclosed in Highland's financial statements?</p> <p>23 A. Yes.</p> <p>24 MR. MORRIS: I have no further questions.</p> <p>25 MR. RUKAVINA: I have none.</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">135</p> <p>1 CERTIFICATE OF REPORTER</p> <p>2 I, BRANDON D. COMBS, a Certified Shorthand</p> <p>3 Reporter, hereby certify that the witness in the</p> <p>4 foregoing deposition was by me duly sworn to tell the</p> <p>5 truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth in the</p> <p>6 within-entitled cause;</p> <p>7 That said deposition was taken in shorthand by</p> <p>8 me, a disinterested person, at the time and place</p> <p>9 therein stated, and that the testimony of the said</p> <p>10 witness was thereafter reduced to typewriting, by</p> <p>11 computer, under my direction and supervision;</p> <p>12 That before completion of the deposition,</p> <p>13 review of the transcript was not requested. If</p> <p>14 requested, any changes made by the deponent (and</p> <p>15 provided to the reporter) during the period allowed are</p> <p>16 appended hereto.</p> <p>17 I further certify that I am not of counsel or</p> <p>18 attorney for either or any of the parties to the said</p> <p>19 deposition, nor in any way interested in the event of</p> <p>20 this cause, and that I am not related to any of the</p> <p>21 parties thereto.</p> <p>22 DATED: November 1, 2021</p> <p>23</p> <p>24 _____</p> <p>25 Brandon Combs, Certified Shorthand</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">134</p> <p>1 MR. AIGEN: None.</p> <p>2 MR. RUKAVINA: Okay. Thank you very much.</p> <p>3 (Whereupon, the deposition adjourned at</p> <p>4 1:19 P.M.)</p> <p>5 --oOo--</p> <p>6 I declare under penalty of perjury that the</p> <p>7 foregoing is true and correct. Subscribed at</p> <p>8 _____, Texas, this ____ day of</p> <p>9 _____, 2021.</p> <p>10</p> <p>11</p> <p>12 _____</p> <p>13 KRISTIN HENDRIX</p> <p>14</p> <p>15</p> <p>16</p> <p>17</p> <p>18</p> <p>19</p> <p>20</p> <p>21</p> <p>22</p> <p>23</p> <p>24</p> <p>25</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">136</p> <p>1 State of Texas</p> <p>2 Dickman Davenport, Inc. Cert 312</p> <p>3 4228 North Central Expressway</p> <p>4 Suite 101, Dallas, TX 75206</p> <p>5 (214) 855-5100 (800) 445-9548</p> <p>6 Email: info@dickmandavenport.com</p> <p>7 www.dickmandavenport.com</p> <p>8 My commission expires 1-31-23</p> <p>9</p> <p>10</p> <p>11</p> <p>12</p> <p>13</p> <p>14</p> <p>15</p> <p>16</p> <p>17</p> <p>18</p> <p>19</p> <p>20</p> <p>21</p> <p>22</p> <p>23</p> <p>24</p> <p>25</p>

Kristin Hendrix - October 27, 2021

A	109:20,21	97:21,25 98:9	124:1 133:21	apologize 15:6
A.M 1:22 57:22	advance 126:2	107:25 119:20	analysis 97:24	59:7 62:16 75:9
ability 69:5,20	adversary 94:25	132:20	and/or 50:13,18	75:22
able 108:23	95:3,12	ahead 73:9	63:22 64:18	appear 118:18
120:18	advice 46:20	113:10,20	69:20 73:25	APPEARANC...
above-styled	88:24	114:11 118:22	110:23	2:1
1:21	advised 38:23	Aigen 2:18 3:4	anniversary	appeared 2:5,12
Absolutely 17:8	advisor 39:1	94:16,23,24	79:21 80:5,14	2:19
accent 56:16	Advisors 1:10	95:23 96:1,21	annual 114:20,23	appears 47:1
access 24:7 54:15	15:14,17,23	98:15 102:5	115:7 117:4	76:12 77:1
accessed 44:19	27:20,23 63:6	103:17 105:24	119:20 120:12	appended 135:16
account 12:11	70:1,4 71:6,10	106:8,23	130:23	applying 125:3
37:7 91:15	74:17 76:24	110:14 129:21	annually 80:13	approval 16:5,8
accountant 16:19	84:9 85:6 92:16	134:1	annum 80:12	48:12 49:4
46:10 73:15	99:10,14,16,25	Akard 1:24 2:4	answer 7:6,6	50:25 51:2
74:3 78:4 84:24	100:2,15,18	alleged 40:16	23:11,14 35:2	101:3 104:20
accounting 11:16	119:16 120:7	96:3,7	39:19 51:5 52:3	124:24 127:19
12:8,12,18	123:24 129:15	Allocation 38:24	64:20 75:2	approve 48:15
17:14,15,16,21	Advisors' 122:16	39:1	114:11 118:10	49:5 104:1,2,24
18:4 19:9 20:3	affiliate 34:25	allowed 135:15	122:13	132:15
20:12,20 21:13	87:23 120:7	allowing 95:13	answered 41:4	approved 48:18
31:16,23 35:7	affiliated 15:11	amended 107:25	51:3 57:17	48:19,21 104:7
40:11 45:17	affiliates 18:19	132:24	100:9 106:6	104:8,14
46:3 51:11,11	86:24 87:17	amendment	answering 66:1	approximately
51:18 56:11	99:6,11,13	128:4	answers 42:10	95:18 110:7
102:4 111:9	100:4,17	amort 19:22 90:8	43:1 57:6	April 12:7
112:18,23	130:16	amortization	anybody 35:25	area 107:19
126:11	affirmative	73:25 76:23	40:8 101:7	arose 115:4
accounts 13:21	101:14	77:4,6,9,20	112:8 113:23	ASAP 60:18 64:6
14:8,15 51:24	affix 50:17 114:6	80:20 82:6 85:3	113:25 114:5	asked 51:3 57:17
accrued 79:22	affixed 47:5	85:12,13,17	114:14 116:24	60:10 69:22
accruing 85:15	114:15	131:20	117:20 118:24	88:9 93:4 106:6
accurate 72:22	afternoon 94:23	amount 19:6,7	119:6,11 122:3	119:24
97:19 115:25	ago 33:8 104:21	26:10,12 30:12	122:7 123:8,11	asking 6:10 26:7
accurately 116:2	104:22 109:17	32:23 39:3	124:16 125:2	29:17,19,24
action 11:6	110:10,12	43:16 48:15	126:8 127:10	59:17 62:6
activities 39:20	agree 55:2 57:14	49:2 50:9 87:16	127:14 131:24	64:23,25 77:25
actual 104:12	61:13	87:24 89:9 90:9	132:4,8,11,14	90:8 96:12,13
122:16,25	agreed 25:23	91:19 93:4	132:18,23	aspects 115:1
addition 39:7	26:3	104:6 121:14	133:2	assistant 12:6
41:21	agreeing 53:24	122:10 124:4,5	anymore 76:2	69:2 70:3,9
additional 56:15	agreement 26:5	124:19 133:16	anytime 21:10	88:21
56:20	26:15,21 95:9	amounts 35:8	59:1	associate 11:18
adjourned 134:3	95:13 96:4,8,12	40:2 120:3,4	AP 11:17 12:23	32:7
Adkins 109:16	96:23 97:6,9,11	121:10 123:23	32:7 109:5	assume 6:25

Kristin Hendrix - October 27, 2021

42:11,25 44:3 48:24 57:5,18 80:6 81:10 95:23 99:19,22 Assumes 114:8 assuming 36:10 40:23 80:19 81:5 82:21 106:17 assumption 95:25 assumptions 100:10 105:23 attached 83:7,11 123:22 attachment 83:23 123:18 attachments 83:20 attempts 102:10 attention 115:16 attorney 2:5,12 2:18 135:18 audit 18:25 98:1 114:20,23,25 115:1,7 116:5,9 117:8,11,14,15 117:23 118:3 118:15 130:23 131:24 132:4,8 132:14,18,23 133:2,15 audited 97:16 115:25 116:16 116:21 117:1,5 118:19 119:1 133:17 auditors 97:18 115:3,24 130:24 131:18 audits 12:24 August 83:18 84:1 author 44:10 authority 36:23	50:25 51:1 110:22,25 authorization 129:12 authorize 49:17 authorized 114:6 114:15 127:18 129:3 authorizing 50:12,17 available 21:24 Avenue 2:11,17 aware 10:1 15:17 23:8 28:20,22 28:23 29:10 39:6 90:22 91:1 91:2 95:11,16 96:7,14 98:13 98:15,19 101:9 101:17,20,21 102:7 106:8 107:11 109:1,9 109:13,18,25 120:11 126:24 <hr/> B back 13:3,6 16:12 17:12 20:9,16 22:20 24:12 26:4 29:16 44:24 45:6 50:3 52:8 55:1 60:4,18 64:3,11,19 69:2 74:10 76:3 81:9 81:23 84:8 88:20,23 94:3,9 99:24 113:23 133:12 background 10:12,19 16:12 29:25 67:19 bad 26:25 balance 63:8,22 80:10 118:6	121:11 balances 13:18 84:15 89:23 bank 13:20 63:7 63:21 92:18 bankruptcy 1:1 108:6,15,22 109:2 133:12 bargain 84:5 base 26:19,22 27:4 based 25:18 38:3 40:23 82:5 125:17 126:22 128:17 basically 23:7 115:24 basis 21:23 66:22 77:20 81:14 104:9 batch 12:22 Bates 82:14,18 120:1 bear 80:11 beginning 62:24 81:14 behalf 2:6,13,20 102:1 110:21 111:1 127:10 127:14 129:4 129:15,17 believe 10:24 12:7,12,16 13:4 16:18 33:3,5,24 34:2 35:8 38:4 43:13,17 50:10 58:22 82:5,8 84:21 88:8 93:13 97:10 99:8 107:3 109:15 112:19 123:7 believed 103:20 best 20:1 44:20 55:10 100:12	112:9,20 116:1 118:9,21 121:14,17,24 122:2,12 126:8 better 30:2 42:22 67:22 big 23:3 38:21 115:15 bills 14:6 109:3 bind 111:1 birth 10:16 bit 28:9 44:7 55:1 56:16 58:9,24 98:12 131:18 bits 7:14,17 Blair 32:6,6,7 112:7 blind 64:12 board 60:5 86:15 119:24 121:12 121:25 122:5,9 122:17 123:1,6 bonus 25:18,21 26:1,6,8,19,22 27:4 bonuses 108:23 book 113:1 booked 112:10 112:22 119:8 books 73:11 87:17 borrower 69:10 borrower's 69:5 boss 24:11,17 25:1 76:8 brackets 78:19 79:1 brand-new 111:20 Brandon 1:22 135:2,25 break 30:8 52:5 62:17 75:16,17 83:9,16 93:16 94:6 110:15	briefly 10:12 16:12 brought 50:2 115:16 bunch 63:1 burn 82:11 business 14:12 64:5 buyouts 108:6 <hr/> C calculated 124:11 calculating 73:24 call 26:19 34:23 37:7 38:1 45:11 45:13 61:22 66:4 67:23 71:5 72:5 74:11,11 74:20,21 75:5 75:23,25 79:20 92:2,3,6 93:21 93:25 99:4 100:12 106:14 106:16 120:23 125:25 126:14 129:23 called 26:21 62:12 65:14 74:14,15,24 84:1 92:4 111:15,22 calling 107:2 calls 126:4 Capital 1:6,9 14:22,23 15:4 27:23 85:5 108:1,16 117:2 care 38:11 carried 115:2 case 95:9 100:24 103:4 cash 12:21 13:21 21:24 22:6,18 22:19 23:1,4,4
---	--	--	---	--

Kristin Hendrix - October 27, 2021

34:17 63:8 66:22,25 67:2,5 67:5 69:1 81:11 81:12,14,19,20 109:4 125:25 126:4,14 categorize 24:6 cause 1:21 22:6 116:7 117:16 135:6,20 caused 39:16 92:12 124:22 cell 75:2,3,4,13 Central 136:2 CEO 13:23 60:24 Cert 136:1 certain 14:6,18 18:19 26:13 29:2 36:16 37:15 49:13 64:20 95:14 96:16 119:17 120:18 123:2 127:22 certainly 82:11 86:17 121:22 certificate 53:14 53:18,20 135:1 certified 16:19 135:2,25 certify 135:3,17 CFO 13:9,13,22 23:12 25:10 chain 59:4,12 62:5,15,24 85:21,25 86:3 86:13 90:4,5 chance 75:4,18 change 32:11 79:1,12 84:10 85:2,6 90:23 91:3 changed 58:4 123:6 changes 43:15	44:2 49:1 135:14 changing 57:4 98:12 107:18 characterize 24:13 111:13 charge 13:19 18:7 114:24 115:11 charged 10:10 charges 76:12 chase 15:9 check 60:12,15 64:19 93:15,16 102:23 105:8 checked 63:16,16 64:22 checking 64:24 checks 13:18 clarify 47:14 88:10 clear 6:20 113:12 clearly 38:13 clients 63:6 close 120:6 collect 28:21 collectibility 68:23 collectible 130:25 collection 30:14 collects 27:3 college 10:20 11:10,14 column 79:5,11 80:22,24 columns 78:14,15 Combs 1:22 135:2,25 come 84:5,14 85:2,10,11 comes 31:8 comfort 131:19 comfortable 50:23 coming 16:6	48:25 99:5,10 126:25 131:21 comma 15:4 comments 120:14 commingle 110:9 commission 136:4 common 40:10 communicate 23:17 communicated 23:23 communicating 23:24 communications 23:22 64:10 90:16 companies 52:14 company 39:10 44:13 compensate 40:15 compensation 25:17,21 26:1,6 26:20,22 27:4 39:9,12 competent 24:18 24:20,21 complete 72:10 completed 116:5 118:15 completely 17:3 47:8 114:24 completion 135:12 compliance 17:14 comport 44:20 compounded 80:13 computer 47:16 135:11 computerized 1:24 concern 131:2	concerning 111:9 124:18 127:7 concerns 63:13 63:15 condescending 25:3 conduct 38:3 confess 82:23 confident 37:22 confirm 62:2 confirmation 92:15,17 confused 78:12 confusion 47:15 connection 116:9 117:7,10,22 118:3 124:23 consent 39:1,24 consist 26:1 constituted 116:12 118:2 consulted 46:13 contact 6:9,11 contending 96:4 context 31:13 44:1 59:25 86:12 continue 130:2,6 contract 131:20 controller 11:19 11:23 12:1,4,6 13:4 25:6 69:2 70:3,4,9,10 88:21 conversation 36:22 42:4 65:3 96:1,6,14 99:9 99:13 104:22 106:17,24 130:3,19,22 conversations 23:13 34:16,20 36:5,17 37:14 37:15 48:14 49:22 50:20	69:1 88:18 95:24 96:3,15 96:22 102:18 105:4,13,25 107:8,11,16 108:8,14 copied 64:12 86:6 copies 55:14 56:13 copy 83:17 copying 59:13 61:3 63:1 83:18 corporate 10:6 11:16 17:15,16 17:21 18:4 19:8 19:15 20:3,11 20:20 21:13 31:16,23 35:6 45:17 46:2 51:11,18 56:11 102:4 111:9 112:18,22 126:11 corporateacco... 111:22 correct 14:12,20 14:24 15:4,5,12 15:13,16,19,20 18:5,6 23:5,6 27:1,5 29:4 35:23 36:8,12 38:9 40:12,21 41:3,5,6,10,23 41:24 45:22,23 45:25 46:1 53:19 56:14 57:12 60:25 65:12 66:16,17 70:19,20,23,24 76:16 78:21 80:20,21 81:5 83:20,21 87:25 88:1 95:6,7 100:1,5,6,18,19
---	---	---	---	--

Kristin Hendrix - October 27, 2021

101:15,16,19	crunch 109:5	22:14,15,18	88:3 90:17	113:14 134:3
101:20 102:25	CSR 1:23	23:1 25:7,7	93:10,11	135:4,7,12,19
103:3,4 105:6,7	curiosity 76:6	26:17 28:21	defaulted 67:22	describe 12:18
105:10,11	current 11:2	29:6 38:19	defendants 1:11	53:16
106:5,7 118:12	currently 11:19	39:15 53:7	1:20 2:6,20	described 17:17
120:18,21	120:5	54:22 55:12	95:11 96:4	99:9 116:16
124:3 128:1,13	cut 15:9	59:5,19 66:8,20	defense 95:12	119:7
129:20 131:11		68:1 76:20 77:2	96:7,12	description 14:1
134:7	D	77:6,9 81:11,12	defenses 95:9	110:3
correctly 32:18	D 1:22 135:2	81:18,25 82:7	defined 114:3	detail 66:12
33:23	Dallas 1:3,25 2:4	84:17 88:3,11	definition 113:16	details 17:5
correspondence	2:18 136:2	88:14 90:24	degree 10:22	25:14 28:7
123:3	dark 94:17	99:6 100:15	deliver 117:17,22	determine 97:6
corresponding	date 10:16 19:3	101:25 114:25	delivered 116:8	97:25 102:11
84:16	26:13 32:22	debtor's 40:16	116:11 117:25	determined
counsel 2:5,12,19	34:21 43:16	68:18 77:4	118:1 128:18	97:22
6:15 7:4,23,25	50:8 57:24 58:7	86:16	demand 4:11 5:2	Dickman 136:1
8:19,22 9:8,12	78:17 79:9,21	debtors 117:12	18:19 19:21,25	difference 103:22
9:20 10:10	80:6,13,13,14	Dec 4:3,11	20:4,13,17,21	different 19:25
28:10,17 33:6	93:25 105:4	December 11:11	21:3,4,5,8,23	54:19 73:16
135:17	107:1	14:2,5 15:6,10	22:7,13 28:22	87:22 96:11
count 42:10 43:1	dated 30:20	15:21 16:3	29:11,14 46:16	103:17 124:2
57:6	31:16 135:22	24:22 60:25	62:11 66:5 85:6	direct 27:7
couple 83:19	dates 57:22	61:6,12 62:10	85:14 98:17	directed 99:17,19
course 6:9 46:18	Dave 8:24 34:18	65:14 66:3,7,18	130:14 131:9	129:18
55:3 103:23,24	34:23 38:13	66:24 67:13,16	131:13	directing 48:16
104:13,19,23	46:7 111:8	67:20 68:1,8,14	demanded 62:11	101:4
courses 16:15,16	112:6	68:21 70:22	demanding 24:13	direction 23:12
court 1:1 6:18	Davenport 136:1	71:4 72:4 74:10	Denton 10:15	53:21 60:23
27:13 30:13,25	David 3:14 13:1	75:19 76:4	department	63:2 73:7 101:7
courteous 94:12	31:16 33:17	88:12 93:21	11:17 18:2,5,8	135:11
CPA 10:24 11:2	DAVOR 2:5	98:21,25	18:12 51:12	directions 48:25
11:6,21 115:17	day 48:15 57:25	100:25 101:11	57:12 112:23	directly 40:9,22
create 43:12,18	58:6 80:2	101:19 102:7,8	depend 18:17	41:12 49:1
45:8 48:17	112:13 134:8	102:19,20	depended 49:16	70:14,17
created 18:21	days 9:23,25 10:5	103:20 105:3,3	depending 73:16	102:16
44:18,19,21	28:17	105:18 125:20	depends 18:16	disciplinary 11:5
48:7 58:1	deaccelerate	127:6 129:24	69:10 77:24	disclose 119:24
119:12	107:13	decided 26:2,3	deponent 135:14	disclosed 97:15
creating 13:21	deal 20:21 36:25	40:14 52:15,18	deposed 6:13	97:21 133:17
111:18 125:22	debtor 14:24,25	deciding 23:8	28:2	133:22
126:20	15:1,2,3,7,10	decision 29:14	deposition 1:13	discretionary
creation 126:16	15:19,21 16:4	105:2	1:18 7:8,9 8:1,6	26:8
126:18	18:1 21:20,21	declare 134:6	8:10,15,17,20	discuss 62:9 66:4
credit 91:18	21:22 22:1,2,5	default 68:16,19	8:23 9:14	68:4,7 74:16

Kristin Hendrix - October 27, 2021

88:12 discussed 28:8 38:4 43:13 66:21 67:9 74:18,20 81:13 92:5 96:25 97:2 discussing 66:19 67:20 117:18 discussion 9:5 50:21 61:7 65:9 66:7 69:5,19 92:25 93:7 122:22 123:4 discussions 9:8 25:20 28:11,12 28:17 40:6 60:1 61:9,11 62:13 68:22 98:8 127:6 disinterested 135:8 distinct 29:3 45:24 DISTRICT 1:2 DIVISION 1:3 doctor 42:11 doctored 83:3 doctoring 42:24 57:4 document 32:25 47:2 49:19 72:8 76:10 82:13 86:1 88:7 111:19 119:8 119:25 documentation 9:16 documentations 47:8 documents 9:18 10:7 42:6 43:7 43:9 44:3 47:9 48:5,18 49:8,13 50:2,3,11 54:11 57:7,14,20	69:16 77:13 82:10,18 doing 6:7 43:8 45:20 74:4 dollar 19:7 40:2 48:15 49:2 50:9 Dondero 2:20 5:2 15:12 21:11,20 21:21 22:6,19 23:7,14,18,23 23:24 24:2,7 34:19 35:24 36:2 40:14,20 52:12,19,22 53:7 73:8 81:14 83:18 94:24 99:18 101:2,4 101:17 102:11 102:16 103:7 103:12,19 104:1,7,14 108:9 116:19 116:24 117:20 118:23,24 122:3,7 123:19 124:8,10,13,16 124:18,25 127:20 132:15 Dondero's 104:19 130:15 Donohue 59:13 59:17,22 62:25 63:21 64:3,16 64:22 65:5,9 92:18,19,22,24 93:8 door 35:1 draft 17:24 drafted 17:1,3 drafting 16:16 17:22,23 18:12 19:16,21 20:12 29:13 drive 54:9,16 55:14	drukavina@m... 2:7 DSI 61:19 62:6,9 63:3,24 67:4 68:7,13,23 69:14 77:3 88:12,23 92:18 92:19 126:13 due 16:6 59:18 66:23 73:9,25 86:24 87:5,17 87:17,22,25 89:9 90:8 102:8 103:20 105:4,6 120:5,23 123:23 124:1,5 124:19 125:4 125:19 126:2 126:25 127:11 127:15 128:20 128:24 129:7 130:7 duly 1:19 6:2 135:4 duties 12:19 97:12 duty 20:25 <hr/> E <hr/> E-l-l-i-n-g-t-o-n 18:9 e-signature 47:10 47:12 48:1,4,5 48:8,9,12,18 49:9,15,18 50:1 50:13,17,23 e.g 120:6 earlier 43:14 45:7 99:8 112:12 113:13 120:14 123:15 125:7 126:12 129:22 early 116:5 128:19	earn 26:23 educational 10:18 effect 54:11 67:21 68:15 effectuate 101:7 106:15 effort 97:6 efforts 102:10 either 18:21 29:13,20 31:1 34:17,23 37:3 46:7,13 50:1 54:12 58:20 62:6,9 71:4 84:24 99:15,17 110:15 124:24 127:19 129:24 135:18 electronic 54:22 electronically 56:3,12 Eliason 46:7 78:3 112:7 elicited 130:13 Ellington 4:3 18:9 60:4,9,12 60:15 61:10 email 2:7,14,22 3:14 4:3,7,21 5:1,5 23:17 31:12,15,20,23 32:1,4,20,25 33:3,25 36:3 37:10,19,25 38:14 41:17,21 42:5 48:20 50:11 54:11 59:4,12,22 60:1 60:2,3,25 61:2 61:6 62:4,8,15 62:24,25 63:11 63:14,15 64:22 82:16,19 83:2,6 83:11,11,12,18	83:23 84:19 85:25 86:3,13 86:22 90:4,5,12 92:22 108:12 111:8,21,21,25 112:3,5,13,17 120:2 122:19 123:5,18,23 126:7,8 136:3 emailing 90:8 107:2 emails 9:16,18 41:18 49:23 81:9 82:22 115:3 employed 11:21 70:18 employee 109:23 110:2,6 employees 16:3 108:19,24 109:10,13,14 employment 26:5 26:15 69:25 70:7 engagement 115:14 ensuring 131:19 entire 11:17 114:25 126:20 entirety 86:18 entities 15:11 21:16 22:6,12 22:19 70:18 81:15 101:5 124:2 129:4 entitled 82:12 entity 21:20,22 22:7 23:2 35:14 53:13 63:4,5 84:16 104:4 entries 78:13 80:23 entry 78:24 79:19 erroneous 122:5
--	---	---	--	---

Kristin Hendrix - October 27, 2021

error 38:22 39:9 39:16,21,23 40:10 44:7 established 9:11 28:8 83:16 estimate 20:10 event 135:19 events 38:21 95:15 96:16 116:13 118:3 118:19 eventually 109:5 everybody 25:13 112:2 125:24 126:1,3,4 evidence 105:22 114:9 118:9,21 121:17 122:12 133:20 exact 25:25 36:5 37:14 48:5,13 107:1 117:12 Exactly 78:16 Examination 3:3 3:4,5,6 6:3 94:22 110:19 111:5 example 81:1 Excel 77:12,15 78:9 exchanged 108:12 excluding 28:16 29:18 execute 48:18 49:5 executed 18:24 47:9 130:15 executing 19:17 execution 18:13 20:12 32:15 exhibit 3:10,12 3:14,17,19,21 3:23,25 4:1,3,7 4:11,14,17,19	4:21 5:1,5 30:14,15,18,19 30:21 31:15,18 32:21 33:1 34:4 34:11 35:21 36:20 37:19 38:12 42:15,16 43:6,21 44:18 44:19 56:19,21 59:4,9 62:14,14 62:21,23 65:13 65:18,21 72:11 72:13,16 76:10 76:17,19 79:8 82:6 83:1,4,15 83:17 84:8,14 84:18,19 85:7 85:17,20,21,22 85:25 86:3,13 87:21 88:2,4,7 89:21,22,25 90:1,3 111:7 119:7,15,23 123:16,22 124:5 exhibits 3:8 30:6 42:17 43:4 44:21 45:22 46:19 48:11,19 50:13,17 52:8 55:17,24 56:25 57:16 58:10,25 113:13 existing 84:20 expect 85:16 expense 103:24 expertise 16:18 expires 136:4 Explain 19:19 explained 6:15 31:7 explicit 60:23 explicitly 32:5 53:1 expressly 71:14	Expressway 136:2 extent 108:13 external 46:14 eye 6:9 <hr/> F <hr/> faced 11:5 facilitate 91:7 fact 21:18 49:5 57:15 64:15 65:1 67:13,16 99:22 121:21 128:23 130:13 facts 114:9 fair 17:5 21:19 22:3 23:21 35:5 42:20 70:14 95:25 96:8,21 96:24 97:18,20 98:6,7 99:25 100:20,23 101:8,12 103:5 105:16 106:4 108:4 116:2 133:20 fairly 36:15 faithfully 57:3 familiar 27:13 65:20 66:11 86:2,5 107:20 115:19 122:16 family 23:4 far 20:14,16 24:19,21 49:7 80:24 favor 130:15 February 12:2 26:4 fee 39:1,24 feel 86:18 fell 13:24 felt 104:25 figuring 93:17 file 56:13	filed 28:24,25 29:6,8 30:13,24 files 32:25 filing 18:25 final 123:6 finance 10:22 financial 4:4 12:22 59:18 62:7 69:15 97:16,17 115:12,25 116:16,21 117:1,5,11 119:2 122:4 133:17,22 financials 12:23 37:18 41:8 60:11 86:24 118:11,14,19 121:3,7,20,25 122:8 find 31:13 72:8 83:8 93:24 94:8 102:23 finding 98:2 fine 47:8 48:2,4 86:19 finish 96:11 finished 31:10 finishing 46:14 firm 18:22 44:16 first 6:2 9:1 11:13 20:11 63:17 70:21 81:17 82:13 95:8 113:23 120:15 five 51:4 94:3 110:10 133:12 five-minute 93:15 110:14 fixing 55:15 flip 46:25 Floor 1:25 2:11 flow 109:5	flows 63:8 focus 12:17 folders 18:25 folks 62:16 67:4 85:24 follow 47:23 60:5 60:9 72:5 follow-up 4:23 followed 104:11 following 47:22 follows 6:2 forecast 67:5 128:17 forecasted 67:8 forecasts 12:21 13:21 17:18 67:5,9 125:8,10 125:14,17,18 125:23 126:7,8 126:16,19 130:3,6 foregoing 134:7 135:4 forgive 97:10 forgiven 95:14 96:16 109:10 133:3,6,11 forgiveness 133:15,21 form 14:14,21 15:24 16:22 17:6 18:14 19:11 20:23 22:8,21 24:8,15 28:3 34:6 35:10 36:13 37:11 38:7 39:17 41:1 41:13 45:3 46:4 47:20 48:22 49:10,20 50:4 51:14,20 52:1 53:9 55:5,19 56:4 58:16 65:16 69:8 70:15 73:20
---	--	--	--	---

Kristin Hendrix - October 27, 2021

74:5 75:7 77:22	Friday 9:1,4	78:22 107:23	guarding 24:7	131:4
78:10 80:3,16	function 12:21	113:10,20,23	guess 89:22	HCMFA's 39:8
82:1 87:7 88:15	functions 117:15	114:11 118:22	guys 126:14	87:17 117:11
89:2,15 96:18	fund 1:9 27:23	133:12		117:23 118:6
102:2 103:13	38:24 39:2,2,8	goes 94:9 99:3	H	118:18 119:1
105:19 106:18	85:6	going 6:25 17:12	H-i-l-l-i-s 32:12	HCMLP 3:15
113:9,19	funds 38:23	20:9,16 26:23	half 81:17	4:19 5:6 32:13
129:21	59:18 119:17	27:3 29:16 30:6	hand 59:3 82:25	60:24 64:4
format 77:12	120:8	30:10,14,18	handed 88:6	86:24 87:5,18
formatting 79:3	further 3:5 10:23	34:3 40:6 42:7	handle 20:12	111:11 120:6
82:5	32:15 62:1	42:20 44:2	50:8	120:23 124:19
forth 64:11	92:13 110:19	50:22 52:8	handled 20:4,21	129:2,18
forward 64:2	133:24 135:17	54:18 56:20	happened 20:7	HCMS 2:20
94:16	future 14:7 16:5	57:2 58:24 59:3	21:8 36:11,11	94:25 98:16,24
forwarded 92:15	120:5	59:3 60:5,9	37:21 101:1	100:1,22,25
92:17		64:19 65:13	131:17	101:10,18
found 54:9	G	67:7 71:6 72:8	happening 20:11	102:1,19
foundation 75:11	gears 58:24	72:11 74:10	61:5	105:18 107:5
four 9:8,12 100:5	general 34:21	76:10,20 78:7	happy 23:3 93:22	127:10 128:23
fourth 107:25	46:18 54:20	81:9 82:10,11	HARDT 2:3	129:6,18
frame 17:12	69:6 90:20	82:13,25 83:1	HARR 2:3	131:13
66:19 69:7	generally 13:17	84:8 85:20,21	Hayley 32:2,14	HCRE 2:20
73:16	13:24 19:13	87:19 88:2	46:7 78:3,6	94:25 98:17,24
Frank 4:21 7:10	34:8 35:2 43:10	93:20 95:2,23	112:6	100:1,22,25
7:21 8:1 13:7,8	72:22 81:20	105:23 111:10	Hayley's 46:8	101:10,18
23:13 24:5	96:13,15	131:1,2	HCM 4:4,9	102:1,20
34:19,23 35:24	120:11	good 6:4 24:17	HCMF 3:25 4:1	105:18 107:3
38:14 52:19	getting 11:20	26:24 94:23	HCMFA 3:15 4:4	127:10 128:23
53:20 60:10	18:24 48:11	127:8	27:10,22 28:1	129:6,18
63:16,18 64:10	60:2,3 81:12	governs 26:11	28:13 29:6	131:13
64:23,23 65:1	101:3	graduated 10:21	30:12,19 32:13	hear 72:1
67:3 71:5 73:8	give 20:10 31:13	11:9,12	38:19,23 39:12	heard 40:17,20
74:14,15 84:1,7	74:16 110:4	great 53:20	40:1,15 53:25	held 12:8 133:11
91:10,22 92:4	129:3	greater 16:19	59:18 60:19	hell 75:4,10
99:5,17 100:13	given 49:18	group 14:4 17:13	62:7,11 63:6,22	help 76:22 78:13
101:2 102:15	101:6 122:9	19:9,10,16 20:3	64:18 66:5	93:17 105:23
104:4,21,23,24	123:1	31:24 35:7,22	69:15,20 70:7	helped 12:20
106:14,20	gives 16:19	37:22 40:11	70:10 85:18	Hendrix 1:14,18
107:2 112:6	giving 53:21 54:5	43:14 45:7,18	87:5 99:4 100:2	5:5 6:1,6 30:10
124:24 125:25	Global 38:23	46:3 49:16	110:22 111:1,1	30:23 56:19
126:13 128:9	39:1	51:18 56:11	111:11 115:1	57:2,8 62:23
128:14	go 10:12 17:5	73:19,23	117:4,16	65:13,21 76:19
Frank's 115:16	44:4,24 48:1	111:21,25	118:15 120:6	78:12 79:15
frankly 104:24	55:1 62:24 64:2	112:3,5 117:16	120:23 121:25	86:3 90:3 93:13
fresh 111:20	67:4,5,11 73:8	126:12	124:2,5,19	94:5,23 110:20

Kristin Hendrix - October 27, 2021

111:6 134:13 hereof 80:13 hereto 135:16 hi 60:4 higher 89:20 Highland 1:6,9 10:2 11:13,21 12:5,19 13:10 14:4,4,11,22,23 15:3 16:10 17:10,13,21 18:1,11 21:5 25:6,15 26:4,9 26:24 27:2,2,22 28:12 51:7,10 51:19 65:14 66:4 71:7,11 81:10,18,23,23 85:5 87:25 92:17 107:21 108:1,16,17,21 108:22 109:2,2 109:9 110:21 117:1 119:24 133:5,10 Highland's 7:23 7:25 8:19,22 114:20,23 116:4,16 131:24 132:3,7 132:13,17,22 133:1,15,22 Hillis 32:12 history 11:9 Hold 62:18 hope 57:13 97:13 hopefully 82:11 hoping 68:15 house 75:1 hundreds 50:7 51:8 hypothetically 22:4,17 hypotheticals 21:17	I i.e 114:9 idea 58:2,7 75:12 75:24 89:13 93:1 105:17 106:3 identification 30:16,22 31:19 42:18 43:5 57:1 59:10 62:22 65:19 72:14 76:18 83:5 85:23 88:5 90:2 identifies 123:23 124:1 identify 112:2 125:18 identifying 66:23 image 47:2,5,19 48:2 imagine 15:7 immediately 61:14 important 93:14 Impressive 11:23 include 71:18 72:10 100:1 118:25 121:13 130:7 included 15:14 16:9 31:24 102:5 111:25 118:6,13 121:21,22 122:10 123:12 124:4,5 127:2 includes 63:5,7 including 88:11 124:2 income 63:7,21 incoming 67:7 incorrect 123:9 124:14 increase 94:19 incumbency	53:13,17,19 INDEX 3:1 indirect 27:7 indirectly 70:12 individualized 131:14 Info 3:25 4:1 info@dickman... 136:3 information 4:9 29:25 34:13 61:14 63:3,7 64:17 65:5,11 69:12,15 84:6 86:15 116:3 127:2 130:10 informed 112:21 125:24 126:1 initiated 74:11 92:3 ink 49:8,13 55:3 55:8 ink-signed 55:11 input 29:25 88:24 installment 128:24 129:7 instance 1:20 20:6 23:8 35:21 instances 24:1 40:1,24 instruct 127:11 127:15 instructed 128:9 128:11 instructing 101:18 instruction 72:2 74:17 76:8 100:16 101:14 101:22 103:12 129:4,11 instructions 24:2 24:3 32:16 69:14 76:1	100:21 101:9 103:19 129:3 instructs 7:5 insurance 39:10 insurer 39:8 intend 113:5 interco 32:14 34:11 intercompany 17:22 18:13 19:17 20:4,13 20:16 21:3,8 34:12 35:7 36:19,25 37:12 40:24 53:8 111:15,16 124:23 125:4 126:25 133:6 interest 19:7 43:16 49:2 68:18 73:25 78:14,16,24 79:20,22 80:11 85:15 125:4,19 interested 84:9 135:19 interjects 64:4 intermediary 24:3 internal 18:21 41:8 46:13,20 69:19 internally 77:1 investigation 97:5 invoice 108:13 involved 18:12 19:16,20,24 36:21 39:20 40:9 126:14 131:8 involvement 19:10 irrespective 26:16,24	IRS 49:3 issue 79:3 95:14 96:16 97:25 98:16 114:2 118:8 131:2,2,6 132:5,9,19 issued 131:9 issues 40:7,10 60:16 61:21 115:4,15 J J-F-O-R-S-H... 44:10 Jack 59:13 60:4,8 64:6 65:2 92:18 James 4:8 5:1,2 61:14,15,18,21 61:25 62:3 Jan 4:8 5:2,5 January 10:17 24:24 28:20 29:6,11 62:25 64:15 71:25 88:2,21 89:9 90:5,7,17,22 91:4 93:8 106:10,25 127:23 128:8 128:15 jealousy 24:7 jerk 24:12 JFORSHEE 44:10 Jim 2:20 21:10 23:14,18 34:19 35:24 52:19,20 54:2 63:2 64:10 67:3 73:8 84:4 99:18 101:2,4 102:16 104:1,7 104:14,22,25 105:1 125:25 Jim's 99:21 jive 87:20
---	--	--	---	---

Kristin Hendrix - October 27, 2021

jmorris@pszjl... 2:14 job 6:20 11:14 17:9 20:25 24:19,22 43:11 45:1,14 103:1,6 103:10 John 2:12 4:7 8:24 95:21,23 97:4 JONES 2:10 June 86:25 87:6 116:5 120:23	47:16 48:6,6 50:10 52:18,25 57:25 59:6 76:15,21 78:15 82:15 89:17 92:18,19 99:21 101:4 103:24 104:17 107:19 108:7,25 110:2 117:4 118:15 120:22 121:6 121:19,20 122:15 124:4 128:7 130:24 131:12	Lawler 109:20 109:23 Lawn 2:17 lawsuit 28:24 29:5,8 lawsuits 28:1,9 28:13,25 29:17 29:21 30:1 lawyer 9:4 lawyers 44:14 lay 67:7 leading 39:20 108:15,21 109:1 learn 95:20 ledger 76:12 left 61:9 87:15 legal 7:23,25 10:9 16:13 17:14,25 18:2,5,11,21 19:10,16 28:10 46:14,20 72:21 lend 21:22 23:1 110:22 length 93:25 let's 10:12 11:9 12:17 14:8,18 21:17 30:8 34:25 44:24 45:13 47:14 54:19 55:1 72:10 78:1 99:24 115:11 120:23 letter 4:11 65:14 115:14,23 letters 29:11,14 115:14,20 letting 92:18 liabilities 118:14 liability 40:16 118:6 license 10:24 11:2 limited 107:25	lines 61:7 listed 78:17 litigations 27:8 little 28:9 44:7 55:1 58:9,24 78:12 94:17 98:12 131:18 live 10:14,15 LLP 2:17 loan 3:15,25 4:1 18:18 31:5 32:14 33:25 34:11,12,14,25 35:14,17,17,22 36:19,25 37:6,7 37:17,17 38:25 39:12 40:15,21 45:13,15,18,22 46:12,14 48:15 49:1,4,5,24 50:9 58:5 72:25 76:24 79:21 80:6,7 87:22 103:22 104:6 104:20 111:15 111:16,18,20 112:10,23 113:2 119:9 124:23 125:4 133:6 loans 35:9,12 37:4,6,13,22 38:6 39:4 41:9 41:12,19 48:14 48:17 50:7,19 50:22 51:8 53:21 66:23 67:8 98:16,17 98:17,20,25 106:9 107:13 109:9 110:5,6 126:2 131:19 logically 36:10 40:23 71:18 logs 75:19	long 7:20 21:24 74:21 75:6 110:4 look 30:17 54:15 57:7 75:18 77:2 78:11 80:21 93:20 94:6 looked 31:5 123:16 looking 56:21,23 58:10 79:24 81:10 86:21 87:14 119:23 looks 60:24 64:9 76:23 77:4 79:19 loosely 17:2 lot 28:25 lots 40:6 LP 15:4,15 27:20 27:23 70:1,4
K				M
K-l-o-s 8:25 keep 29:1 77:6,9 95:4 125:24 126:1 kept 54:22 55:11 56:12 77:5 121:20 kind 11:5 18:4 23:21 24:6,11 34:3 50:3 54:19 81:13 122:21 Klos 3:14 8:24,25 9:5,12 13:1,6 13:10 25:10,21 29:24 31:16 33:17 34:10,18 35:21 36:18,24 37:20 38:12 46:7 97:2,3 111:8,13 112:6 Klos' 13:2 41:17 knew 40:3 126:3 128:19 know 6:24 19:20 19:23 20:19 25:14,25 28:7 33:10,11,13 36:11 38:17,21 39:22,25 40:1,5 43:21 44:11	knowledge 27:6 36:1,4 37:14 40:11,13 52:15 69:11 77:7 108:4 112:9,11 112:20 116:1 121:14 122:2 known 67:14,17 97:11 KOPF 2:3 Kristin 1:14,18 5:5 6:1,6 32:1,2 32:14 57:8 61:20 134:13	L L.P 1:6,10 labeled 82:15 labels 30:7 laid 24:12 land 84:5 landline 75:2 large 35:8 lasted 75:6 late 126:9 Lauren 4:22 86:21 law 2:5,12,19 6:18 18:22 44:16		ma'am 31:21 57:7 87:1 111:4 machine 1:24 maintain 6:9,10 maintained 77:1 82:7 maker 19:4,5 21:3 43:15 132:1 making 13:20 21:5 81:7 99:20 101:2,25 103:22,23 104:3 management 1:6 1:9 12:20 13:14 13:15 14:2,24 15:4,22 17:17 27:23 85:5 108:1 115:13 115:19,23 manager 12:8,12

Kristin Hendrix - October 27, 2021

12:18	45:24 47:4	123:12 124:11	24:8,15 28:3	Nancy 108:9
manual 104:9,12	48:10,13 50:15	mind 71:18	30:2 31:10 34:6	NAP 27:14
March 12:2	51:1 53:23 54:4	minute 30:8	35:10 36:13	native 78:9
mark 59:3	54:10 57:23	minutes 94:3	38:7 39:17 41:1	NAV 38:22 39:9
marked 30:15,21	58:9,20 69:18	mischaracteriz...	41:13 42:9 45:3	39:16,20,23
31:18 42:17	72:24 74:4 81:6	116:25	46:4 47:20	40:10 107:21
43:4 56:25 59:9	81:17 86:8,10	Mischaracterizes	48:22 49:10,20	108:5
62:21 65:18	90:15,20 91:21	41:2	50:4 51:3,14,20	near 14:7
72:13 76:17	92:6	misleading 42:9	52:1 53:9 55:5	necessarily 17:23
83:4 85:21,22	mentioned 11:24	missed 88:25	55:19 56:4	19:10 103:25
88:4 90:1	13:14 22:12	105:12	57:17 58:16	need 9:16 14:6
113:13 119:14	25:9 29:10 41:7	misspeak 30:5	62:18 65:16	19:2 21:11
material 97:22	44:25 45:21	mistake 51:12	67:10 69:8	25:14,25 34:24
98:1,4,6,10	51:6 64:21	113:1,18 114:2	70:15 73:20	52:6 54:1 59:1
104:6 120:3,4	125:7	116:20 117:21	74:5 75:7,11	81:19,20 82:12
133:16,21	merit 25:17	118:25 119:12	77:22 78:8 79:7	86:19 93:17
materials 121:12	met 108:11	125:3 132:9	79:9,13 80:3,16	needed 21:21
maturity 80:13	metadata 42:21	mistakenly 51:25	82:1,14,16,23	22:5,18 23:1,4
MBA 10:23	42:21,24 43:21	mistakes 51:17	83:2,6,10 85:25	40:1 53:12
11:20	43:24 44:8,24	51:19,22	87:7 88:15 89:2	81:11,14,23
mean 7:17 13:15	56:15,20 57:4	120:19	89:15 93:22	104:25
14:22,23 15:3	Michael 2:18	modified 44:19	94:15,17 95:21	needs 104:7,8,13
19:1 35:16	94:24	57:8	95:25 96:2,6,18	negative 78:20,25
48:20 57:24	michael.aigen...	moment 72:9	96:23 102:2	79:2
68:24 78:13,15	2:22	Monday 9:2	103:13 105:19	never 40:19,20
87:11,24	mid 128:19	monetize 68:2,10	106:6,18 111:6	49:12 51:12
111:16	middle 89:8	money 13:21	113:11,22	55:14 68:17
meaning 27:20	million 30:12,20	21:11,13,15,21	114:13,19	70:14,17 96:25
27:22 54:25	32:13,21 33:1	21:21,22 22:5	118:12,23	97:2 101:6,6,14
70:18	33:19,20,25	34:24 35:13	119:5 121:19	103:6 108:11
means 27:15	34:5 35:3 36:25	37:7,17 53:21	122:15 128:3,4	119:8
35:15 58:22	37:12,12 38:18	54:23 81:15,19	129:22 133:24	new 2:11 21:14
71:16 111:18	38:22,25 39:3,7	81:22,24 92:16	mouth 23:21	32:14 34:11,25
meeting 34:17	39:8,11,23	111:19	move 9:10 21:11	36:19 45:9
67:2	40:15,21 42:15	month 106:10	21:13,15 94:16	111:15,16,18
meetings 66:22	42:16 43:2,3	months 40:7	109:8	NexPoint 5:6
66:25	58:5,11,13,13	morning 6:4 9:3	moved 23:4	15:14,17,22
memorandum	66:9,13 81:1,1	67:11 82:14	multiple 54:19	16:5 27:11,15
48:20	81:2 85:1,6,9	125:6	MUNSCH 2:3	27:18,19,20
memory 9:17	87:3 90:23 91:3	Morris 2:12 3:6		28:2,13,21 63:6
19:14 20:9 29:3	91:23 110:23	4:7 7:3 8:24 9:6	N	63:22 64:18
29:7,17,19,23	111:10 112:14	9:9 14:14,21	name 6:5 32:8	66:8,12,20
32:20,24 34:3	113:14,14	15:24 16:22	44:12 57:18	67:13,22 68:2
37:9 38:2 41:22	120:24 121:13	18:14 19:11	94:24 109:24	68:15,19,24
42:1,20 43:7,10	122:10 123:5,9	20:23 22:8,21	110:3	69:15,20 70:1,4

Kristin Hendrix - October 27, 2021

70:22 72:12	80:9,10,14,20	notice 88:3 89:8	39:17 41:1,13	25:3 28:19 30:5
76:24 77:7,13	81:8,23 85:14	notices 28:22	45:3 46:4 47:20	31:23 32:11
77:20 80:20	90:18 91:16,19	noting 14:5	48:22 49:10,20	33:22 34:3 36:1
81:7,22 84:9	91:23 92:14	November 59:12	50:4 51:3,14,20	38:2 39:14
85:2 88:3 90:9	127:16 133:10	61:6 62:6,10	52:1 53:9 55:5	42:13 43:6
90:17,23 91:16	notes 4:12,19	66:19 67:12,19	55:19 56:4	49:25 58:23
91:23 92:13,16	14:9 16:16	68:1,7,14,21	57:17 58:16	60:11 62:1
93:10,11 120:6	17:22 18:13	71:4 72:4 74:10	65:16 69:8	63:17 70:25
123:24 127:14	19:17,21,21	75:18 76:3	70:15 73:20	79:25 84:8 85:1
127:16 128:23	20:4,13,17,22	93:21 127:6	74:5 75:7 77:22	89:24 93:7 94:1
129:6,18	21:4,8,14,14	128:20 129:24	80:3,16 82:1	110:17 112:8
131:13	22:13 27:3	135:22	87:7 88:15 89:2	113:11 115:17
NexPoint's 16:5	28:14 30:24	November/Dec...	89:15 96:18	118:18 119:5
16:9	31:1 38:11 41:7	125:14	102:2 103:13	121:13 123:15
Nope 8:7 76:7	42:7,22 43:12	NPA 4:17 27:18	105:19 106:6	126:15,22
91:12	45:2 46:21,22	27:19 86:24	106:18 113:8,9	129:13 130:19
normal 34:16	47:6 50:1 52:10	99:4 100:3	114:17 118:9	131:23 134:2
103:23,23	52:16,17,24	number 79:2,6	118:21 119:3	once 104:5
normally 107:15	53:1,8,25 54:5	79:11,18 80:23	121:17 122:12	ones 53:2 109:18
North 1:24 2:3	54:12,23 55:3,8	84:10,13 85:2,9	129:21	ongoing 77:20
10:22 11:13	55:11 56:2,8,10	87:20,21 89:14	objections 7:5	oOo-- 134:5
136:2	59:2 62:11	89:18,20,21	obligations 14:19	open 120:5
NORTHERN 1:2	65:15 66:5	111:7 120:1	16:6,10 118:7	opinion 98:5
note 3:10,12,17	69:21 73:10	123:5,9,12	132:1	opposed 23:23
3:19,21,23 4:14	77:10 84:16	124:2,11,14,17	obligor 15:18	39:12 49:8
5:3,6 14:19	85:12 95:14	numbered 1:21	obviously 14:11	52:12 98:17
15:18 16:10,21	96:16 97:10	numbers 26:1	35:6 59:1	oral 91:25 95:9
17:1,3,6 18:16	111:2 113:6,11	78:20 80:21	occasion 22:18	95:13 96:4,8,12
18:19 19:22,25	113:12,16,18	84:15	occurred 95:15	96:23 97:6,9,11
21:4,23 22:7,20	114:2,7,16	NY 2:11	96:4,17 97:7	97:20,25 98:9
23:9 28:21	116:7,11,15,25		106:17	132:20
30:11,19 31:8	117:18,22,25	O	Oct 4:22	orally 37:10
32:15,21 33:2	118:1,7,18	oOo-- 1:4	October 1:15,21	50:16
33:20 35:3,18	119:1,12 120:6	Oak 2:17	86:22 94:9	order 97:6
42:15 43:2,3,11	121:15,21,22	oath 6:17 95:5	122:17,19	ordinary 103:23
45:9 46:16	122:11 123:13	object 113:19	office 10:1 34:1	104:13,19,23
56:21,22 58:11	124:6 125:19	114:8	54:8 57:3	original 30:11
58:13,13 66:9	126:25 127:12	objecting 114:10	officer 52:13	54:23,25 55:11
66:13,16,20	127:24 128:8	objection 7:3	69:25 70:7	originally 48:7
67:13,22 68:2,5	128:21 130:8	14:14,21 15:24	officers 109:10	outcome 27:8
68:8,10,16,19	130:14 131:5,8	16:22 18:14	109:13	outgoing 67:7
68:23,24 71:13	131:9,13,14,25	19:11 20:23	oftentimes 13:23	outside 18:21
71:19 72:6,11	132:5,9,15,19	22:8,21 24:8,15	34:23	89:6
72:12,16,20	132:24 133:3	28:3 34:6 35:10	oh 67:21	outstanding 66:5
73:4 76:13 77:7	133:16	36:13 38:7	okay 6:11 7:1,7	80:11 120:4

Kristin Hendrix - October 27, 2021

121:21 131:19 131:22 overdue 60:19 overhead 103:24 104:3 oversaw 12:22 115:1 overseeing 117:14 owed 54:23,24 59:18 84:16 108:23 owing 123:23 124:1	17:9,13 25:17 26:8 27:4 44:8 70:13 97:11 103:5,10 107:15 109:11 120:12 130:23 133:7,11 participate 126:15 particular 17:13 52:11,13 56:8 81:18 98:19 parties 21:12 99:21 135:18 135:21 Partners 2:21 94:25 partnership 107:25 pass 94:14 passwords 47:17 patient 25:1 pattern 38:3 Paul 109:16,20 109:21 pay 14:19 21:4 21:12,13 22:7 22:13,20 39:2 40:1 68:24 69:20 108:17 108:23 109:3 payable 14:8,16 51:24 120:5 payee 133:11 payment 16:4 32:17 67:17 70:22 72:6 88:13,25 90:8 92:8,11,12,15 92:17 93:9 100:25 101:15 101:24 103:6 103:11,18,20 103:22 104:3,6 105:12,14	106:20 107:4,5 107:7,9 124:21 124:22 125:3 127:15 129:14 129:16 payments 13:20 66:23 67:8 71:6 71:10,16 73:3,4 73:9,12,18,25 74:17 76:13 78:17 81:7 98:20,24 99:5 99:10,13,16,20 99:21 100:14 100:17,18,21 100:24 101:3,4 101:7,10,13,19 102:1,8,11,19 102:23 103:2 103:15,24 104:18,20 105:5,9,17,25 106:9,13,25 107:12 126:2 126:24 127:7 127:11,18,23 128:7,12,15,20 128:24 129:7 129:10,19 130:7,14 131:21 PC 2:3 PDF 30:13,24 58:22 penalty 6:17 134:6 people 37:22 47:18 61:3 73:16 76:14 perceived 120:19 percent 49:14 80:12 performance 26:16 period 14:2 15:6	107:21 108:5 108:16,22 109:1 125:15 135:15 periodically 23:18,19 perjury 6:17 134:6 person 13:18 23:8,18 37:25 38:1 44:11 46:6 131:23 132:3,7 132:13,17,22 133:1,14 135:8 personal 10:5 personally 23:17 73:13 101:20 101:21 114:24 123:19 130:2 phone 38:1 71:5 72:5 74:20,21 75:2,3,5,5,14 75:19 76:15 92:2,3,6 93:15 93:21 94:6 99:4 100:12 picking 79:20 pictures 47:11 pieces 7:14,18 pile 58:25 111:7 pin 21:18 pinpoint 90:21 pique 76:6 place 135:8 Plaintiff 1:7 2:13 play 27:3 29:13 114:22 115:6 117:7,10 126:18 please 6:24 10:13 10:16 11:8 32:13,15,16 42:11,25 61:20 61:22 62:2 63:3 64:5 66:10	75:20 89:25 122:18 point 42:2 44:14 55:2 66:16 69:24 70:6 policy 104:9,11 104:15 pop 84:5 portion 8:9 position 9:7 12:8 110:4 positive 79:6,11 79:18 possible 32:17 36:21 58:15,18 65:1 93:6,19 95:4 109:21 possibly 41:20 55:21 58:7 73:8 104:22 postsecondary 10:19 potential 16:4 68:4,8 potentially 25:19 34:19 95:14 97:10 practice 17:20 18:11,18,23 34:16,21 48:17 49:7,9 50:20 53:7,12,16,17 prep 32:15 preparation 7:8 9:13 prepare 16:20 45:8 84:18 130:2 prepared 16:25 42:12 46:19 54:6 76:12 77:3 84:21 86:15 128:18 preparing 95:22 97:17 131:24
P				
P.M 1:22 134:4 PACHULSKI 2:10 page 3:2,8 46:25 78:23 79:4,8 80:22 100:8 119:25 120:15 paid 14:6 26:13 39:8 51:25 78:14,14,15,24 79:5,11 80:22 109:6 paper 34:25 37:6 45:14,18 49:1,4 49:24 50:22 54:22,25 55:3 55:14 56:13 papered 35:14,16 37:16 45:22 46:3,12 50:7 51:7 54:13 55:18 56:10 57:15 58:5 72:21 papering 35:17 45:13,25 72:25 paralegal 82:17 paren 120:5,6 part 7:9 16:2				

Kristin Hendrix - October 27, 2021

prepayments 81:25	privy 64:9,11 69:19	68:5 71:13,19 72:11,12,16	19:12 20:19,24 22:9,22 24:9,16	49:2 80:12
presence 25:4	probably 9:15	76:13 77:7,10	28:4 29:5,16	ratio 107:21
present 9:4,6,12 24:5 45:24 90:15 97:3	17:2 49:14 50:6 58:22 61:9 63:15 99:15 109:8 126:13	80:9 81:8 113:6 113:11,12,16 114:2,7,16 116:7,11,15 117:17,22	34:7 35:11 36:14,23 37:1 38:8 39:18 41:2 41:14 45:4,5 46:5 47:21	108:5
presented 116:1	proceed 61:20,25	118:7 119:12	48:23 49:11,21	re-up 86:16
presenting 46:14 97:18	proceeding 46:20	122:11 124:6	50:5 51:15,21	reached 108:5
preserve 78:8	proceedings 95:1	prompt 128:14	52:2,4 53:10	read 7:9 8:9
pretty 14:11 109:8	95:3,12	prompted 83:22	54:18 55:6,15	32:18 82:21
previous 100:9	process 31:7	prospect 53:20	55:20 56:5	86:17 119:25
previously 17:24 48:25 131:9	32:16 45:11,12 120:12	provide 7:12	58:17 65:17	reading 81:9
Pricewaterhou...	produce 78:9	9:19 15:21	66:10 69:9	ready 94:16
116:9,12 117:5	produced 1:18	30:11 42:21	70:16 73:21	real 11:14
117:17 118:2,5	17:24 33:15	59:17 63:3 64:5	74:6 75:8 77:23	really 35:13
130:20	34:1 59:4 67:10	64:16 119:16	80:4,17 82:2	67:21
principal 30:12	76:20 82:14,19 125:6	121:25	84:14 86:9,19	reason 6:23
78:14,17 79:5	product 115:13	provided 17:24	86:20 87:8,19	22:23,25 52:11
79:11,23 80:10	production 10:1	33:5,9,10 61:14	88:16 89:3,16	52:13 56:1,6,7
89:23 121:14	33:15	70:12 89:17	95:10 96:10,19	72:7 77:3 82:5
122:10 124:5	profitability	121:11 122:5	100:9 102:3	82:8 101:13
124:19 125:3	26:25	129:11 135:15	103:14 105:20	129:13,16
125:18 130:14	program 47:25	provides 120:7	106:19 113:9	131:1
print 56:1	programs 47:16	providing 15:10	113:24 124:17	recall 7:19 10:8
printed 42:8,12	projections 17:18	54:8 65:5	127:8 128:5	21:6 34:15,20
42:24 47:18	promised 39:2	public 16:19	questions 6:21,24	36:16 37:2
55:18,22 56:7	promissory 3:10	pull 119:14	7:6 8:8 61:21	44:11 46:10
57:4,21,22,24	3:12,17,19,21	pulled 49:3	95:2 110:16	50:14,20 51:17
57:25 58:11,14	3:23 4:12,14	purpose 86:12	115:4 133:24	51:23 52:4
58:21,22	5:3 14:9 15:18	125:22	quick 52:5 95:4	55:25 56:7
printing 55:23,25	16:10,16,20	purposes 39:5	107:23	59:22,25 60:2,3
printouts 42:21	17:1,3,6,22	98:1 126:23	quickly 6:16	60:8,10 63:11
prior 9:25 10:4	18:13 19:17	purview 89:6	109:8	64:1 65:3 66:7
19:17 28:11	27:3 28:13,21	put 23:20 84:25	quite 36:21 41:20	67:3 68:22,25
35:24 40:25	30:11,19 31:1,8	PwC 97:21 98:1	104:24	69:22 72:3 73:1
55:2 65:23	32:21 33:2	117:22	quote 120:3	74:11 83:22
71:25 86:9 96:6	35:18 38:11			84:4,23,25
105:3 108:6	42:7 43:11,12	Q	R	86:12 88:17
124:24 127:19	45:1,9 47:6	qualification	R-o-e-b-e-r 32:10	91:25 92:3 93:5
128:12 133:12	52:10,24 53:1,8	16:20	raise 131:1	93:7 102:21
privileged 9:8	53:25 54:5,12	question 7:1	raised 95:12	104:21 105:15
95:24	54:23 55:11	14:10,22 15:25	range 89:10	107:6 108:25
		16:23 18:15	rate 19:7 43:16	109:14 112:3
				112:13,15,17
				116:4,15 118:5
				119:5,8,19
				120:16 123:4
				123:15 127:5

Kristin Hendrix - October 27, 2021

129:25 130:17 131:5 133:10 recalling 109:16 Receivable 4:19 receivables 130:25 131:22 received 63:13 64:21 71:5 129:2 receiving 32:4 124:23 recipient 60:25 recognize 44:12 recollection 20:2 21:7 38:20 52:21,23 54:14 55:10 64:13 67:12 77:13 100:11 106:24 107:2,8 108:2 121:24 126:9 reconciling 13:20 record 7:15,16 30:8,9 44:4,6 52:6,7 53:3 56:18 62:19,20 72:10 75:5 78:8 82:19 83:13,14 93:20 94:4,21 98:14 110:18 recorded 73:11 81:24 recording 73:18 records 10:6,6 59:18 62:7 64:5 73:12 reduced 135:10 refer 99:25 reference 71:13 119:1 121:2,6,9 referenced 34:5 84:6 referencing 33:25 121:10 referred 96:2	referring 66:25 100:2,5 reflected 118:7 123:12 reflecting 43:15 refresh 9:17 42:1 42:20 69:18 108:1 regarding 86:1 90:17 107:12 regardless 99:16 regularly 23:24 reinforces 41:8 reissue 21:14 related 9:13 21:11 33:1 38:22 57:21 95:9 96:7 98:16 99:21 135:20 relates 32:21 64:17 relation 115:7 relieve 93:10,11 rely 42:8 remember 19:19 20:14 21:3 28:16 30:25 31:3,4 32:4 41:19 54:7 55:23 61:2,5,8 64:23,25 65:4,8 65:23 66:18 67:20 74:21,24 85:10 86:14 90:5,7,12 100:13,14,16 100:20 106:16 109:15,24 110:3,5,6 remotely 6:8 renewal 120:12 reorganized 25:7 25:15 26:17,24 27:2 rep 115:13,19,23	repaid 23:10 repay 69:6 repeat 14:10 22:10 28:15 44:22 66:10 rephrase 6:25 report 12:25 25:9 25:12 114:25 115:25 117:14 123:6 reported 1:23 13:6 36:22 reporter 135:1,3 135:15 reporters 27:13 reporting 12:22 12:23 13:22 reports 127:3 repository 54:22 55:9 represent 27:10 46:25 57:3 83:1 94:24 107:23 represented 2:4 2:11,18 93:5 representing 42:23 request 4:9 60:5 84:22 requested 63:3 63:21 64:5,17 84:2 135:13,14 requesting 63:25 requests 10:1 69:14 115:3 required 7:6 21:4 respect 26:25 29:20 43:8,17 48:10 51:12 73:3,17 92:13 98:24 106:9,12 112:13 114:22 127:16 respectfully 39:5 respecting 45:22	respectively 113:15 respond 122:23 responded 65:1 response 60:13 120:15,19 122:16,25 responsibilities 97:12 103:6,10 responsibility 69:7 102:23 105:2 responsible 14:5 17:21 31:7 45:18 77:19 97:17 101:25 126:20 131:23 132:3,7,13,17 132:22 133:1 133:15 responsive 10:6 rest 44:23 restrictive 47:17 restroom 52:6 93:16 restructured 19:21 retail 86:15 119:17,24 121:25 122:5,9 122:17 123:1,6 reveal 50:11 review 8:4 50:11 54:11 119:21 125:10,17 135:13 reviewed 9:15,19 reviewing 32:24 115:11 revised 17:6 right 12:6 13:21 14:16 25:7 27:15,20 28:18 35:22 45:9,10 47:19 49:3	56:14 65:6,7 69:16 75:14 80:24 83:17 88:21 91:24 96:9 102:25 111:23 120:20 122:19,20 123:21,24,25 124:2 127:25 130:11,12 131:10 Roeber 32:9 112:7 role 12:5,18 13:12 29:13 46:8 69:25 70:7 73:3,4,6,17,22 106:12 114:22 115:6,10 117:7 117:10,12 126:18 roles 73:6 roll-up 72:22 131:9 rolled 79:23 131:13 Romey 61:15,18 61:25 62:3 room 75:15 roughly 39:3 routine 20:4,21 20:25 routinely 21:1 row 131:3 RPR 1:23 rude 25:3 Rukavina 2:5 3:3 3:5 6:4 7:4,15 7:17 9:7,10,11 14:15,23,25 16:2,25 18:17 19:14 21:2 22:11,24 24:11 24:18 28:5 30:4 30:10,17,23
--	--	--	---	---

Kristin Hendrix - October 27, 2021

31:12,20 34:10	125:6 126:12	86:23 87:1,5	services 15:11,22	96:10 112:13
35:16 36:18	saying 37:19	89:8,11 105:9	70:13,13 86:16	single 104:2,3
38:10 39:22	41:15 49:23	115:11 120:9	119:17,19	sitting 30:25
41:4,17 42:19	53:4 73:8 76:14	120:22,25	120:7	33:24 42:1
43:6 44:4,7	93:19 99:5	121:4 126:4	set 26:10,11,14	50:15 53:23
45:5 46:8 47:22	101:9	seeing 31:4 50:14	35:15 53:21	54:4 55:24 82:4
49:6,17,25	says 32:1,6 34:10	57:14 65:23	shape 37:10	85:16 91:21
50:10 51:6,17	44:10,13,18	90:12	shared 54:9,16	105:16 106:23
51:24 52:5,8	57:8,22,25	seek 46:20	55:14 70:13	situation 34:9
53:4,15 55:9,23	60:23 63:2 64:4	seeking 24:3	77:16 86:16	slightly 96:10
56:9,19 57:2,20	78:25 86:23	seen 33:14 65:22	shareholders	SMU 10:23
58:19 59:11	87:10 89:9	69:13 72:15	39:2	so-called 15:22
62:19,23 65:20	120:2,22	76:21 88:7	sheet 118:6	somebody 35:19
69:13 70:19	scan 55:13	122:25	121:11	37:8 53:12,12
72:15 73:24	schedule 76:24	Seery 4:8 5:1 8:8	sheets 63:8,22	53:19 55:21
74:8 75:9,13	77:5,6,21 80:20	25:12,20 29:24	short 74:22 75:17	129:3
76:19 78:1,7,11	82:7 85:3,13,17	59:13 60:18,22	75:23 93:15	soon 32:17
79:8,10,14 80:8	131:20	61:12 62:4,6,9	shorthand 1:24	sophisticated
80:19 82:4,21	scheduled 16:4,7	63:1,2 64:4	135:2,7,25	14:12
82:25 83:8,13	schedules 77:9	65:9 67:3,14,17	shortly 11:11,12	sorry 11:12 14:24
83:15 85:24	85:12	67:25 68:13,22	show 82:10	19:15 47:8 52:4
86:2 87:9 88:6	schooling 10:20	69:14 88:11,23	showing 92:15	57:21 66:2
88:20 89:5,19	Scott 4:3 18:9	96:25 125:25	131:21	82:23 92:12
90:3 93:23 94:5	60:4,12,15	126:13	sick 82:17	97:3 103:9,23
94:14,19	61:10,13 62:1	Seery's 8:10,20	sign 52:20,20	109:20
110:17,20	Scott's 60:13	send 29:14 32:13	53:7,20,22 54:3	sort 25:21 43:23
113:8,19 114:8	scratch 17:3	34:24 37:7	104:25 105:1	96:11 97:24
114:17 118:9	search 10:5	53:21 59:7	113:5,18	sought 88:24
118:21 119:3	second 7:15 44:5	60:11 62:2	115:13	sound 58:15
121:17 122:12	62:18 78:23	63:17 83:22	signatory 52:14	sounds 98:3
125:7 128:2	80:22 99:24	sending 13:19	signature 46:15	speak 36:2
130:13 133:25	109:15	36:3 54:12	47:1,6,11,18	speaking 13:17
134:2	Secondly 87:16	60:17 61:2	49:8,14,15	43:11 44:1
	section 80:9 86:1	111:19	114:7,9,15	speakings 95:21
	118:19	senior 12:8,11,11	signed 47:9 52:10	specific 7:19
S	see 6:8 8:5,12,14	12:12,17	52:11,25 55:4,8	21:18 29:7
S-e-e-r-y 8:8	23:3 31:5,20	sense 44:12 58:1	115:14 131:6	34:21 36:4,17
Sadly 94:9	32:25 35:7	sent 28:22 29:11	132:5,9	37:1,14 38:2
salaries 108:17	54:11 57:9,21	37:17 42:9 83:2	signer 53:13	43:10 46:11,22
108:18,19	59:7,15,20 60:6	83:17 92:16,22	significant 20:20	47:25 48:11,13
salary 25:15	60:20 61:23	106:20 107:3	51:19,22	54:14 71:8
sale 68:4,8	63:5,9 64:2,7	111:21 123:19	signing 52:16,24	88:17 90:19
save 55:13 72:19	78:24 79:14	126:11,13	53:25	100:11 101:22
saved 56:11	80:15,18,24	separate 18:5	similar 32:25	103:11,18
saw 41:8 86:6	81:3 84:11 85:6	served 10:1	34:9 38:25	105:21 106:24
115:12 123:19				

Kristin Hendrix - October 27, 2021

127:6 specifically 21:6 21:10 23:11 29:9 34:15 37:8 49:12 50:12,16 50:19 51:2 52:3 52:19 54:1,7 55:8 64:25 65:3 65:4,8 68:25 69:22 77:14 84:19,21 93:5 98:16 103:2,7 125:13,18 specifics 22:4 speculating 58:9 speculation 106:4 sphere 69:6 spit 48:1 spoken 35:23 61:13 spreadsheet 78:9 spreadsheets 31:6 77:12 staff 48:2 stake 27:7 stamp 47:19 82:18 standard 46:16 50:7 53:6,11,15 53:16 55:3 standing 67:2 STANG 2:10 start 54:19 59:11 95:10 100:11 started 11:13,17 20:11 100:10 starting 10:19 11:9 starts 59:12 state 1:23 6:5 10:25 67:25 68:14 76:22 78:16 136:1 stated 48:25	135:9 statement 99:3 statements 4:5 13:20 63:7,8,21 63:22 97:16,17 115:12 116:17 116:21 117:1,5 117:11 119:2 122:4 133:18 133:22 STATES 1:1 status 66:20 stay 26:4 steps 92:13 STINSON 2:17 stop 34:24 stopped 23:22 stored 56:2 straightforward 26:14 Strasburger 44:13,16 Street 1:25 2:4 stretch 109:5 strike 7:24 8:4 15:8 38:16 52:22 53:5 68:12 87:9 90:11 string 122:19 stuff 49:15 stupid 86:9 subject 16:5 119:20,20 132:19 subparts 86:20 Subscribed 134:7 subsequent 14:7 59:25 61:12 64:10 95:13 96:22 105:12 116:13 118:3 118:19 subsequently 32:11	sued 28:21 suggest 124:14 suing 28:5 Suite 2:4,17 136:2 summarize 72:19 summary 7:12 8:14 summer 123:16 124:18 supervision 135:11 supplementally 9:19 supposed 98:20 sure 6:12,15 10:21 11:4,11 12:20 13:20 14:11 18:22 19:23 22:11 26:7 28:16 31:2 33:10,21,22 37:5 42:3,22 43:20 52:25 58:18 60:16 62:1,19 63:17 65:4 66:11 75:21 76:11,11 84:15 99:3 100:7 101:1 107:18 109:22 115:16 125:24 126:23 130:23 130:24 Surgent 29:24 surprise 76:1,3 surprised 94:11 surprises 40:8 76:2 suspect 23:15 switch 58:24 sworn 1:19 6:2 135:4 synopsis 7:12 8:14	system 56:12 77:16 84:20 <hr/> T <hr/> T-h-e-d-f-o-r-d's 86:22 take 25:14 30:8 38:11 45:5 52:5 52:20 72:15 75:17 76:15 82:12 87:10 89:13 92:13 104:1 110:14 taken 1:20 16:15 17:6 45:8 135:7 talk 7:21,24 8:1 8:17,20,23,25 28:10 34:21 44:9 66:11,15 78:1 talked 9:12 97:4 99:8 talking 8:19,22 29:1 64:11 101:2 116:8 121:15,23 125:13 taxes 14:9 team 13:19 17:25 18:21 26:4 31:6 39:15 49:15,18 50:24 51:7 64:16 97:16 102:4 104:11 106:15 115:2 telephone 23:17 74:11 75:23,25 tell 34:13,16,24 44:2 53:1 54:1 54:2 55:7 60:14 63:24 71:23 74:19,23 79:22 79:24 84:3 91:11,15,18 93:24 99:2	100:12 106:14 107:1 109:22 110:8 112:8,25 113:4,17 114:1 114:6,14 116:20,23,24 117:21 118:25 119:6,11 122:4 122:8 123:2,8 123:11 130:22 131:24 132:4,8 132:11,14,18 132:23 133:2 135:4 telling 35:25 37:11 53:24 100:13,21 105:22 115:24 template 18:20 18:24 43:14,18 45:8 46:17 58:4 58:6,12 templates 43:12 50:9 term 17:2 66:9 66:16 67:8,13 73:10 76:24 77:10 98:17,25 100:4 107:20 107:24 125:19 126:2 127:12 127:16,24 128:8,21 130:7 131:5,8,14 terminology 27:14 TerreStar 38:22 test 20:9 testified 6:2 45:7 72:18 112:12 113:13 127:22 129:22 testify 83:10,12 testifying 6:16 testimony 19:8
--	---	--	--	---

Kristin Hendrix - October 27, 2021

20:1,15 26:23 41:2 51:11 56:10 99:9 135:9 Texas 1:2,23,25 10:15,22,25 11:13 134:8 136:1 thank 79:13 94:2 94:11,15 111:4 128:3 134:2 Thedford 4:22 120:2 122:22 Thedford's 86:21 120:15 123:5 thereto 135:21 thing 20:20 30:18 34:4 56:22 58:3 94:20 126:21 things 12:21 18:24 19:2,9 37:21,24 74:18 87:13 100:10 think 20:6 22:11 22:24 24:1,18 24:21 25:13 32:2 33:9 41:4 41:25 42:3 44:13,25 45:1 45:19,19,21,21 46:2 49:16 50:8 51:6 58:3 59:2 61:8,16 64:21 66:1 69:2 72:18 75:22 79:19 80:8 87:12 88:9 88:23 102:22 104:12 109:7 127:22 129:23 Third 2:10 thought 75:22 130:25 three 87:15 125:19 127:24 128:7,8,21	130:7 131:5 Tim 109:20,23 time 9:1,6 11:17 14:19,19 17:12 20:10 22:5,5,12 22:12 23:12 31:5 32:9 33:8 35:6 44:15 45:19 49:14 51:10,18 55:1 64:2 65:10 66:16,19 67:11 69:7,11,24 70:6 72:19 73:16 75:6 77:24 78:4 80:10,10 81:19 82:12 84:4 86:14 90:11 93:8,24 103:16 104:2 108:6,16 108:21,22 109:1 112:25 113:1,4,5,17 114:1,14 116:20,25 123:4,8,11 125:14 128:12 130:20 131:25 132:4,8,11,14 132:18,23 133:2 135:8 timely 128:24 129:6 times 9:12 29:2 51:4 109:4 title 12:13,14 13:2 46:11 69:25 70:7 today 8:23 11:23 13:10 25:6 28:2 30:25 32:16 33:24 41:19,23 42:1 50:15 53:23 54:4 55:24 65:5,8,23	82:4 83:2 85:16 90:13 91:21 94:12 95:1,22 105:16 106:23 121:23 today's 9:14 told 34:12 35:15 35:19,22 36:19 36:24 37:5,8 38:5,11,17 40:22 41:11,18 41:20 60:8 91:9 91:22 103:2,7 104:10,18 106:21,25 top 80:25 topic 88:19 92:5 95:8 96:11 109:7 130:19 topics 98:12 107:18 total 78:14,18 79:22 80:22 track 29:1 tracking 31:6 111:19 training 16:13 transaction 112:10,14,22 transactions 37:4 119:7 transcript 7:9 135:13 transfer 40:14 81:15 91:3,7,9 91:13,22 92:20 92:20 111:14 transferred 38:18 39:23 90:23 111:10 transferring 81:22 transfers 35:8 37:12 38:5 40:24	treasury 12:20 13:14,15 14:1 15:22 17:17 trigger 107:21 108:5 triggers 26:11 trouble 42:10 43:1 true 42:25 134:7 trusted 50:8 truth 135:5,5,5 try 10:5 20:10 95:2,3 105:8 trying 21:18 23:20 84:5 turning 19:22 two 24:4 27:25 29:18 30:1 31:1 37:18 38:4,21 42:7 43:8 46:22 52:16 53:25 54:5 57:7,14 70:13 73:16 86:20 106:9 109:14,18,24 110:6 113:12 116:7,11,25 117:17 118:7 121:15,22 122:10 123:13 124:6 TX 2:4,18 136:2 typewriting 135:10 typical 18:18,23 23:25 typically 21:10 35:1,5,6,12 47:7 52:19 54:2 101:1 typo 87:12 <hr/> U <hr/> Uh-huh 27:16 33:12 47:3	umbrella 13:25 99:23 unable 108:17 109:2 underlying 131:20 understand 6:16 6:20,21,24 10:9 15:3 26:7 27:10 33:22 39:14 41:22 56:16 58:8 84:14 95:5 119:16,23 122:21 125:8 125:15 128:5 understanding 13:3,5 25:1 27:5,25 43:24 44:20 50:22 57:23 62:5 63:20 70:21,25 71:3 78:22 79:17,25 81:6 89:20 98:23 115:9,22 126:5 128:19 131:16 133:14 understood 7:1 39:11 unfortunately 42:4 unilaterally 110:22 UNITED 1:1 University 10:21 unpaid 80:9 upcoming 67:16 72:6 73:3 74:1 126:1 update 43:11 45:1 58:7 77:20 updated 43:18 updating 17:23 18:23 19:1,3,25 50:8
---	---	--	---	---

Kristin Hendrix - October 27, 2021

use 21:17 45:12 47:19 48:12 49:18 59:1 79:1 100:4 usually 24:5	24:6 29:23 34:19 35:24 36:2 37:3,5,9 38:5 47:24 49:7 50:12,16 52:10 52:23 53:24 54:5,13 60:11 62:10 63:1,18 64:3 67:3 71:5 72:1 73:8 74:13 75:20 83:19 84:1 90:4,7,16 91:10,22 93:9 99:5,18 102:16 103:8,12,19 106:14 112:6,8 112:21,25 113:4,17,22,25 114:5,6,13 115:6 116:19 116:23 117:20 118:24 122:3,7 122:22 124:8 124:10,13,16 124:24 125:25 126:6,24 127:3 127:9,19 128:9 128:14,18,19 129:23 130:4 130:11	17:5 44:8,23 66:11,15 75:17 82:18 94:3 we're 6:7 27:22 28:16 29:1 30:6 35:19 50:22 58:9,24 59:2,3 76:11,11 85:20 93:22 100:7 104:3 116:8 125:13 we've 9:11 28:8 50:7 56:21,22 69:16 88:9 114:2 117:18 121:23 website 49:3 week 8:2,10 9:2 9:22,25 10:5 13:22 28:9,17 29:18 60:22 61:6 67:6 86:1 95:19 weekly 66:21,25 67:2 welcome 59:1 86:17 went 9:15 10:22 10:23 24:19,22 49:23 112:17 115:4 weren't 19:25 28:23 40:7,9 64:12 96:7 98:21,24 99:20 100:24 101:13 105:22 106:3 131:1 wire 34:25 106:15 107:3 withdrawn 113:23 117:25 120:3 124:9,21 126:6,7 127:7,9 129:15 132:12	133:9 withholding 116:3 within-entitled 135:6 witness 1:19 16:1 16:24 18:16 19:13 20:25 22:10,23 24:10 24:17 30:3 31:11 34:8 35:12 36:15 38:9 39:19 41:3 41:15 46:6 48:24 49:12,22 50:6 51:5,16,22 52:3 53:11 55:7 55:21 56:6 57:18 58:18 69:10 70:17 73:22 74:7 75:12 77:24 80:5,18 82:3 83:10,12 88:17 89:4,17 94:14 96:20 102:4 103:15 105:21 106:7,20 113:21 114:12 114:18 118:11 119:4 121:18 122:14 135:3 135:10 word 42:6,6 43:7 43:8 45:11 47:2 77:13 words 21:5 23:20 68:14 work 11:8 52:4 98:2 126:22 worked 11:16,18 36:6 61:19 110:5 works 35:1 world 113:25	114:5,14 116:24 117:21 118:24 119:6 119:11 122:3,8 124:17 wouldn't 36:22 37:6 53:22 wrap-up 110:16 write 60:4 writes 60:18,22 61:13,20 writing 37:10 41:14 64:3 114:25 117:14 written 80:7 82:19 91:25 99:7 104:12,15 wrong 57:5 87:13 99:7 wrongly 123:12 www.dickman... 136:4
<hr/> V <hr/> Vaguely 63:12 valid 131:25 valuation 39:15 various 14:15 15:11 59:13 verbatim 27:14 78:25 85:20 86:22 verification 50:3 version 30:13 42:7 versions 30:24 video 8:5,12 59:6 62:16 85:24 videoconference 1:19 2:19 view 41:9 volume 94:19 vs 1:8	<hr/> W <hr/> wait 44:23 walk 10:18 11:8 walking 54:7 want 28:10 47:15 58:25 86:18 95:8 100:7 wanted 52:19 54:2,9 60:12,14 82:17 84:7 102:11 105:9 wanting 65:10 wasn't 108:23 114:6,15 127:7 129:14 Waterhouse 4:21 7:10,21 13:7,8 23:13,22,23	<hr/> X <hr/> <hr/> Y <hr/> yeah 7:2 14:13 21:10 34:9 44:23 51:9 80:18 93:17 year 12:2 20:10 26:14 78:1,5 81:6 104:5 127:15 128:21 128:25 129:7 129:14 130:8 131:21 years 11:15,18 12:9 18:20 21:9 22:25 23:9 36:7 37:18 40:25 51:7 52:4 104:21,22 108:15 109:17 110:8,10,12		

Kristin Hendrix - October 27, 2021

131:3 133:5,12 Yep 76:9 123:17 yesterday 9:2 86:7,9 York 2:11	12.3 120:24 121:13 123:5,9 12/30/29 78:25 13 4:14 72:11,13 72:16 13-week 67:5 125:7,10,14,23 126:16,19 128:17 130:3,6 14 4:17 22:25 23:9 36:7 40:25 76:10,17,19 82:6 85:17 90:22 91:4 93:8 14-year 38:3 15 4:19 36:7 83:1 83:4,15,17 84:8 84:14,18,19 85:7 87:21 89:21,22 123:16,22 124:5 133:5 15(c) 4:22 86:1 121:11 16 4:21 85:21,22 85:25 86:3 119:15,23 17 5:1 11:15 52:4 88:2,4,7 18 5:5 89:25 90:1 90:3 19 59:12 1982 10:17	2.4 30:20 32:13 32:21 33:19 37:12 38:22 39:7 42:16 43:3 58:5,11 111:10 113:14 2.4- 110:22 2.4M 3:12,19,23 2000 86:22 2001 127:23 2004 10:21 11:12 2005 11:11 20:16 21:2,9,19 2009 10:23 2014 133:12 2015 10:24 2017 12:15 19:23 73:2 74:7 131:6 131:12 2018 116:4,16 117:1,11,23 118:3,11,14,18 119:1 128:25 2019 3:14 12:10 12:17,19,25 13:8,14 17:9,12 17:20 18:2,8,10 18:10 19:15 20:2,2 21:2,9 21:19 23:16,16 24:12,14 30:20 31:17 34:14 37:11 38:17,21 39:6,14 40:3,5 41:11,18 44:25 45:14 46:9,12 46:19 47:12,24 48:21 49:6,19 50:2 53:5,6 54:21 55:3,10 56:9,20 57:22 74:7 78:5 80:23 81:6,18 110:21 111:1 112:9,21 114:1 116:5	117:18 118:16 129:8 2020 4:4,11,22 12:7 14:2,5 15:6,10,21 16:3 24:22 59:12 62:6,10 65:14 66:3,7,18,19 67:13,17,20 68:1,8,14,21 70:23 71:4 74:8 75:19 76:4 78:2 79:10 83:18 86:25 87:6 88:12 93:21 98:21,25 100:25 101:11 101:19 102:7,8 102:20 103:21 105:4,18 120:23 122:17 122:19 124:18 125:14,20 126:9 127:6 128:20 129:14 129:17 2021 1:15,21 4:8 5:2,6 24:24 26:4 28:20 29:11 62:25 64:15 71:25 73:3 88:2 90:5 90:17 94:10 106:10,25 128:2,8,15 134:9 135:22 21-03004-sgj 1:8 214 136:3 23 85:1 87:3 23,846,000 84:9 24,471,000 89:9 25 61:6 26 10:17 27 1:15,21 28 125:20	29 83:18 84:1 2nd 58:5 111:9 <hr/> 3 3 3:10,14,17,21 4:11 31:15,18 34:4,11 35:21 36:20 37:11,19 38:12 41:11,18 44:18 56:20 65:14 66:3 111:7 112:21 119:7 30 3:10,12 71:4 72:4 74:10 86:25 87:6 93:21 120:23 129:24 30-year 19:22 30,746,812.33 4:14 30.7 66:9,13 30.7M 4:17 31 3:14 4:15 67:16 70:22 79:10 88:12 98:21,25 100:25 101:11 101:19 102:8 102:19 103:20 105:3,18 131:6 3102 2:17 312 136:1 34th 2:11 3800 2:4 38th 1:25 <hr/> 4 4 3:17 42:15,17 42:19 43:6,18 43:18 44:21,24 45:22,25 46:3 46:19 48:11,19 50:13,17 51:2 52:8 55:17,24
--	---	---	---	---

Kristin Hendrix - October 27, 2021

57:16	<u>7</u>			
42 3:17,19	7 3:23 5:2 43:2,4			
4228 136:2	44:9,19 88:2,21			
43 3:21,23	7.4 38:18 39:11			
445-9548 136:3	39:23 40:15,21			
	122:10 123:12			
<u>5</u>	72 4:14			
5 3:19 30:12 33:1	75201 2:4			
33:20,25 34:5	75206 136:2			
35:3 36:25	75219 2:18			
37:12 38:25	76 4:17			
39:3,8 42:15,16	777 2:17			
42:17,20 43:2,6	780 2:10			
43:18,19 44:21	<u>8</u>			
44:24 45:22,25	8 3:25 56:19,24			
46:3,19 48:11	56:25 58:10			
48:19 50:13,18	89:9			
51:2 52:9 55:17	800 136:3			
55:24 57:16	83 4:19			
58:13,13 94:9	85 4:21			
112:14 113:14	855-5100 136:3			
5- 33:19	88 5:1			
5.0 110:23	881 120:1			
5/31/2020 79:5	<u>9</u>			
500 1:24 2:3	9 4:1 56:21,24,25			
530,000 78:25	58:10			
56 3:25 4:1	90 5:5			
575- 79:23	94 3:4			
575,000 79:12	99 49:14			
575,550 79:6				
59 4:3				
5M 3:10,17,21				
<u>6</u>				
6 3:3,21 4:8,22				
43:2,4,21 44:9				
44:18 62:25				
64:15 80:12				
86:22				
6/30 86:23 121:3				
121:6,11,25				
122:8				
62 4:7				
65 4:11				
683 87:3				

EXHIBIT 195

David Klos - October 27, 2021

<p style="text-align: right;">1</p> <p>1 IN THE UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT</p> <p>2 FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS</p> <p>3 DALLAS DIVISION</p> <p>4 --o0o--</p> <p>5</p> <p>6 HIGHLAND CAPITAL MANAGEMENT,)</p> <p>7 L.P.,)</p> <p>8)</p> <p>9 Plaintiff,)</p> <p>10)</p> <p>11 vs.) No. 21-03004-sgj</p> <p>12)</p> <p>13 HIGHLAND CAPITAL MANAGEMENT FUND)</p> <p>14 ADVISORS, L.P.,)</p> <p>15)</p> <p>16 Defendants.)</p> <p>17</p> <hr/> <p>18 DEPOSITION OF</p> <p>19 DAVID KLOS</p> <p>20 October 27, 2021</p> <p>21</p> <hr/> <p>22 DEPOSITION OF DAVID KLOS, produced as a</p> <p>23 witness, duly sworn by me via videoconference at the</p> <p>24 instance of the DEFENDANTS, was taken in the</p> <p>25 above-styled and numbered cause on October 27, 2021,</p> <p>from 2:30 P.M. to 5:14 P.M., before BRANDON D. COMBS,</p> <p>CSR, RPR, in and for the State of Texas, reported by</p> <p>computerized machine shorthand, at 500 North Akard</p> <p>Street, 38th Floor, Dallas, Texas.</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">3</p> <p>1 INDEX</p> <p>2</p> <p>3 PAGE</p> <p>4 Examination by MR. RUKAVINA 4</p> <p>5 Examination by MR. AIGEN 95</p> <p>6 Examination by MR. MORRIS 109</p> <p>7 Further Examination by MR. RUKAVINA 127</p> <p>8</p> <p>9</p> <p>10 (No exhibits marked.)</p> <p>11</p> <p>12</p> <p>13</p> <p>14</p> <p>15</p> <p>16</p> <p>17</p> <p>18</p> <p>19</p> <p>20</p> <p>21</p> <p>22</p> <p>23</p> <p>24</p> <p>25</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">2</p> <p>1 APPEARANCES</p> <p>2</p> <p>3 MUNSCH, HARDT, KOPF & HARR, PC, 500 North</p> <p>4 Akard Street, Suite 3800, Dallas, TX 75201, represented</p> <p>5 by DAVOR RUKAVINA, Attorney at Law, appeared via</p> <p>6 videoconference as counsel on behalf of the Defendants.</p> <p>7 Email: drukavina@munsch.com</p> <p>8</p> <p>9</p> <p>10 PACHULSKI, STANG, ZIEHL & JONES, 780 Third</p> <p>11 Avenue, 34th Floor, New York, NY 10017-2024, represented</p> <p>12 by JOHN A. MORRIS, Attorney at Law, appeared via</p> <p>13 videoconference as counsel on behalf of the Plaintiff.</p> <p>14 Email: jmorris@pszjlaw.com</p> <p>15</p> <p>16</p> <p>17 STINSON, LLP, 3102 Oak Lawn Avenue, Suite 777,</p> <p>18 Dallas, TX 75219, represented by MICHAEL AIGEN, Attorney</p> <p>19 at Law, appeared via videoconference as counsel on</p> <p>20 behalf of the Defendants Jim Dondero, HCMS and HCRE</p> <p>21 Partners.</p> <p>22 Email: michael.aigen@stinson.com</p> <p>23</p> <p>24</p> <p>25</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">4</p> <p>1 DAVID KLOS,</p> <p>2 having been first duly sworn, testified as follows:</p> <p>3 EXAMINATION</p> <p>4 Q. (BY MR. RUKAVINA) Sir, state your name for</p> <p>5 the record, please.</p> <p>6 A. David Klos.</p> <p>7 Q. K-l-o-s?</p> <p>8 A. K-l-o-s.</p> <p>9 Q. What's your date of birth?</p> <p>10 A. May 6, 1982.</p> <p>11 Q. And where do you live?</p> <p>12 A. I live in Dallas.</p> <p>13 Q. What's your educational background?</p> <p>14 A. Undergraduate and graduate degrees. I went</p> <p>15 to undergrad at Boston College, graduate school at SMU,</p> <p>16 with a degree in, Master's of Science in accounting and</p> <p>17 MBA from SMU.</p> <p>18 Q. Do you hold any professional licenses?</p> <p>19 A. CPA in the state of Texas and, I don't know</p> <p>20 if it's technically a license, but Series 27 from</p> <p>21 FINRA.</p> <p>22 Q. And when did you get your CPA license?</p> <p>23 A. I don't recall specifically, but it would</p> <p>24 have been probably in the '08, '09 time frame.</p> <p>25 Q. Is it current?</p>

David Klos - October 27, 2021

<p style="text-align: right;">5</p> <p>1 A. As far as I know.</p> <p>2 Q. Have you ever been disciplined or threatened</p> <p>3 with disciplinary proceedings?</p> <p>4 A. No.</p> <p>5 Q. And your relevant work experience, please,</p> <p>6 starting with college and afterwards?</p> <p>7 A. Sure. Out of grad school I started working</p> <p>8 at Deloitte in Boston. I worked at Deloitte for</p> <p>9 approximately three and a half years, between the</p> <p>10 Boston office and the Dallas office.</p> <p>11 And then I began working at Highland Capital</p> <p>12 Management in March of 2009 and I've been at Highland</p> <p>13 since then.</p> <p>14 Q. And when you joined Highland in March of</p> <p>15 2009, what was your title or your role at that time?</p> <p>16 A. My title, if I remember correctly, was</p> <p>17 valuation senior analyst. I'm not certain if that was</p> <p>18 exactly it, but it was something along those lines.</p> <p>19 Q. Was it in the valuation group?</p> <p>20 A. Yes.</p> <p>21 Q. And then give me your -- today you're the CFO</p> <p>22 of Highland; correct?</p> <p>23 A. Correct.</p> <p>24 Q. So give me the progression from valuation</p> <p>25 analyst to CFO with, to the best of your recollection,</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">7</p> <p>1 There were a few title changes in between</p> <p>2 there. I think at one point I was manager, at one</p> <p>3 point I was senior manager, at one point I was</p> <p>4 assistant controller and at one point I was controller.</p> <p>5 I can't remember the exact times of all of</p> <p>6 those break points.</p> <p>7 Q. Let me pause you. When you were assistant</p> <p>8 controller, who was the controller?</p> <p>9 A. There was quite a bit of time where I was</p> <p>10 assistant controller and we didn't have a controller.</p> <p>11 I couldn't tell you the exact time frame, but there was</p> <p>12 definitely an extended time frame.</p> <p>13 And then in April of 2020, our existing chief</p> <p>14 accounting officer left and I assumed his</p> <p>15 responsibilities at that time.</p> <p>16 Q. Let me pause you. That's a new term for me.</p> <p>17 Chief accounting officer?</p> <p>18 A. Uh-huh.</p> <p>19 Q. Who was that person?</p> <p>20 A. The person that left?</p> <p>21 Q. The person that was the chief accounting</p> <p>22 officer until April 2020.</p> <p>23 A. Cliff Stoops.</p> <p>24 Q. And do you have any idea or knowledge whether</p> <p>25 at Highland that was like an officer-level position?</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">6</p> <p>1 the approximate year that you were promoted, et cetera?</p> <p>2 A. Sure. I was in the valuation role from</p> <p>3 basically March of 2009 to end of 2009.</p> <p>4 I was then brought over to what we call the</p> <p>5 corporate accounting team, so doing the accounting for</p> <p>6 Highland Capital Management, LP and of the other</p> <p>7 advisor-type entities, where I was primarily focused on</p> <p>8 budgeting and forecasting, credit facility compliance.</p> <p>9 That took from roughly 2010 until I think</p> <p>10 middle of 2011, at which point I was moved over to the</p> <p>11 fund accounting group, so doing hedge fund accounting,</p> <p>12 which was a short role, really, for probably three or</p> <p>13 four months.</p> <p>14 At which point I was brought back to the</p> <p>15 corporate team and also put in charge of the valuation</p> <p>16 group. I held that role in some way, shape, or form</p> <p>17 more or less continuously for the next several years,</p> <p>18 although certainly my role evolved and changed.</p> <p>19 But in terms of the groups that I had</p> <p>20 oversight over, those were the groups. Like I said, my</p> <p>21 role definitely evolved over time from 2011.</p> <p>22 Q. So by 2017 what was your title?</p> <p>23 A. So, yeah, by that time, I was, I believe,</p> <p>24 controller. I might have still been assistant</p> <p>25 controller.</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">8</p> <p>1 A. It was not. It was more of a term of art, I</p> <p>2 would describe it. So it -- so, yeah --</p> <p>3 Q. To the best of your recollection, when did</p> <p>4 you become the controller at Highland Capital</p> <p>5 Management, LP?</p> <p>6 A. I couldn't pin down a specific date. Like I</p> <p>7 said, the responsibilities were very similar. I would</p> <p>8 guess the change from assistant controller to</p> <p>9 controller was probably in the, most likely in the '16,</p> <p>10 '17, maybe '18 time frame.</p> <p>11 Q. Can we agree that as of May 1, 2019, you were</p> <p>12 the controller at Highland?</p> <p>13 A. Yes.</p> <p>14 Q. So let's focus on that time frame, May 2019,</p> <p>15 and you're the controller. Who do you report to at</p> <p>16 Highland?</p> <p>17 A. Frank Waterhouse.</p> <p>18 Q. The CFO?</p> <p>19 A. Correct.</p> <p>20 Q. No one in between you and him?</p> <p>21 A. Correct.</p> <p>22 Q. So what -- explain to me the role between the</p> <p>23 chief accounting officer and the chief financial</p> <p>24 officer in that time frame, '19, '20?</p> <p>25 MR. MORRIS: Objection to the form of the</p>

David Klos - October 27, 2021

<p style="text-align: right;">9</p> <p>1 question.</p> <p>2 THE WITNESS: Very little. Like I said,</p> <p>3 chief accounting officer was more of a term of art.</p> <p>4 What that role actually had oversight of was our retail</p> <p>5 fund accounting, institutional fund accounting,</p> <p>6 operations, so loan settlement and treasury.</p> <p>7 And probably another department or two that</p> <p>8 I'm forgetting, but it did not have any oversight over</p> <p>9 the corporate accounting group.</p> <p>10 Q. (BY MR. RUKAVINA) And in May of 2019, as the</p> <p>11 controller, what were -- what was your role or what</p> <p>12 were your duties?</p> <p>13 A. In May of 2019 I was at that point still</p> <p>14 overseeing the valuation group. I was overseeing the</p> <p>15 corporate accounting group, which my primary direct</p> <p>16 report there was Kristin Hendrix, who really was the</p> <p>17 day-to-day person. But I certainly oversaw her.</p> <p>18 Q. By that you mean the person that answers to</p> <p>19 you?</p> <p>20 A. Correct. Sorry. If I flipped that, I</p> <p>21 apologize. So I was overseeing that group, which had,</p> <p>22 you know, fairly broad responsibilities.</p> <p>23 In terms of, you know, accounting for the</p> <p>24 Advisor, doing forecasts when they were called for,</p> <p>25 performing the audit every year, managing cash,</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">11</p> <p>1 A. Frank Waterhouse.</p> <p>2 Q. And were --</p> <p>3 A. I should clarify too, that the valuation team</p> <p>4 isn't ultimately responsible for the valuations</p> <p>5 themselves, but they do act in this liaison role.</p> <p>6 Q. Perhaps that's my confusion. Is there a</p> <p>7 separate group that handles just valuation?</p> <p>8 A. No.</p> <p>9 Q. Is there an outside consultancy that handled</p> <p>10 that in May of 2019?</p> <p>11 A. I don't know if I would call it consultancy,</p> <p>12 but there was a third-party valuation service provider</p> <p>13 that would do certain of the, call it illiquid, harder</p> <p>14 to value securities.</p> <p>15 Q. So would you say that you were pretty busy in</p> <p>16 April, May 2019?</p> <p>17 MR. MORRIS: Objection to the form of the</p> <p>18 question.</p> <p>19 THE WITNESS: I've been busy throughout my</p> <p>20 career.</p> <p>21 Q. (BY MR. RUKAVINA) In April, May, June 2019,</p> <p>22 how many hours a month do you estimate you worked for</p> <p>23 Highland?</p> <p>24 MR. MORRIS: Objection to the form of the</p> <p>25 question.</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">10</p> <p>1 processing payroll, things of that nature.</p> <p>2 And then at that time I was also put in</p> <p>3 charge of one of the public REITs that was launching at</p> <p>4 the time under the NexPoint flag. And getting that</p> <p>5 team started.</p> <p>6 Q. Did you mention that in May of 2019 you were</p> <p>7 still involved with the valuation group?</p> <p>8 A. I did.</p> <p>9 Q. Did you have a title at the valuation group?</p> <p>10 A. Nothing distinct from my overall controller</p> <p>11 title. These titles were often, like I said, terms of</p> <p>12 art, whether it was controller or chief accounting</p> <p>13 officer.</p> <p>14 Q. What did the valuation group at Highland do?</p> <p>15 A. Well, valuation group was really a liaison</p> <p>16 with both third-party pricing providers, pricing</p> <p>17 services, brokers on the street, front office, members</p> <p>18 at Highland.</p> <p>19 To, you know, to work on valuing the</p> <p>20 securities held across the platform, both for Highland</p> <p>21 HCMLP managed funds as well as affiliated managed</p> <p>22 funds.</p> <p>23 Q. So who did -- did you report to anyone at the</p> <p>24 valuation group? In other words, did it have its own</p> <p>25 separate hierarchy kind of?</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">12</p> <p>1 THE WITNESS: I don't remember. A</p> <p>2 significant number.</p> <p>3 Q. (BY MR. RUKAVINA) Certainly full-time?</p> <p>4 A. Absolutely.</p> <p>5 Q. Would you say that you were working more than</p> <p>6 200 hours a month in that time frame for Highland?</p> <p>7 A. I don't know how many hours. I should</p> <p>8 clarify, we're using Highland very liberally. When I</p> <p>9 say Highland, supporting the entire apparatus,</p> <p>10 platform. Significant number of hours at that time,</p> <p>11 and before and after.</p> <p>12 Q. And let's explore that a little bit. You</p> <p>13 mentioned one of the funds for NexPoint. I'd like to</p> <p>14 talk about NexPoint Advisors, LP, just NexPoint</p> <p>15 Advisors, LP.</p> <p>16 Did you ever have an official role or title</p> <p>17 with NexPoint Advisors, LP?</p> <p>18 A. Not that I can remember.</p> <p>19 Q. Do you know if you were ever the controller</p> <p>20 for that entity?</p> <p>21 A. I'm not certain. I'm not certain.</p> <p>22 Q. But I take it that pursuant to the shared</p> <p>23 services agreement you, as an employee of Highland,</p> <p>24 were providing services on behalf of NexPoint?</p> <p>25 MR. MORRIS: Objection to the form of the</p>

David Klos - October 27, 2021

<p style="text-align: right;">13</p> <p>1 question.</p> <p>2 THE WITNESS: I provided many of the same</p> <p>3 services for NexPoint Advisors that I provided for</p> <p>4 Highland, similar types of services.</p> <p>5 Q. (BY MR. RUKAVINA) And briefly about Highland</p> <p>6 Capital Management Fund Advisors, LP, HCMFA, did you</p> <p>7 ever have like an official title or role with that</p> <p>8 entity, to your knowledge?</p> <p>9 A. Again, not that I can remember.</p> <p>10 Q. Not to your knowledge, the controller ever of</p> <p>11 that entity?</p> <p>12 A. I'm not certain whether I was or not.</p> <p>13 Q. But you provided services to that entity as</p> <p>14 part of your role at Highland pursuant to shared</p> <p>15 services?</p> <p>16 A. Similar to NexPoint as I described.</p> <p>17 Q. When you were controller of Highland, was</p> <p>18 that an officer-level position at Highland?</p> <p>19 A. No.</p> <p>20 Q. When did you become the chief financial</p> <p>21 officer of Highland?</p> <p>22 A. Chief financial officer?</p> <p>23 Q. Uh-huh.</p> <p>24 A. 2021, March.</p> <p>25 Q. After Mr. Waterhouse was gone?</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">15</p> <p>1 Q. Do you have an expectation as to when the</p> <p>2 winding down and monetization of Highland and its</p> <p>3 assets will be complete?</p> <p>4 A. That's very hard to speculate, especially</p> <p>5 given the amount of litigation that's going on because</p> <p>6 I don't know when that's going to play out and that's a</p> <p>7 material asset.</p> <p>8 Q. Have you discussed with Mr. Seery how long</p> <p>9 that might be?</p> <p>10 A. Not that I can specifically remember.</p> <p>11 Q. Do you believe it will be at least probably</p> <p>12 two years, from today?</p> <p>13 A. I don't know.</p> <p>14 Q. This bonus compensation, does it or any</p> <p>15 amount of it depend on how well Highland or the</p> <p>16 claimant trust, how well they do vis-a-vis collecting</p> <p>17 money from creditors?</p> <p>18 A. Not that I can think of. I'd have to</p> <p>19 probably go back and look and understand the back-end</p> <p>20 piece to say definitively.</p> <p>21 Q. And back-end piece, does that mean whenever</p> <p>22 the winding down is completed?</p> <p>23 A. Yeah, like I said, I'm not exactly -- I'm not</p> <p>24 completely facile with the exact timing, if it's</p> <p>25 completed 100 percent or 80 percent, what kind of</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">14</p> <p>1 A. Yes.</p> <p>2 Q. And I'm going to ask you a little bit about</p> <p>3 your compensation today at Highland.</p> <p>4 You don't have to give me specific numbers</p> <p>5 unless I ask you, please, but I take it you have a base</p> <p>6 compensation?</p> <p>7 A. Yes, I have a base.</p> <p>8 Q. Do you have any bonus structure compensation?</p> <p>9 A. Yes, I have a bonus.</p> <p>10 Q. And what is that bonus number or whether it's</p> <p>11 paid out based upon or contingent upon?</p> <p>12 MR. MORRIS: Objection to the form of the</p> <p>13 question.</p> <p>14 THE WITNESS: As I understand, it's based on</p> <p>15 my offer letter.</p> <p>16 Q. (BY MR. RUKAVINA) On your what?</p> <p>17 A. My letter for extending an offer.</p> <p>18 Q. Tell me, what is your -- without having to</p> <p>19 use express numbers, what is your bonus compensation?</p> <p>20 When is it paid, et cetera?</p> <p>21 A. Yeah, so it's not too dissimilar from the</p> <p>22 prior Highland plan that has semiannual installments</p> <p>23 payable. And then there's a, kind of an end of plan</p> <p>24 bonus when -- I don't remember the specifics on exactly</p> <p>25 what triggers that, but it's back-ended in the plan.</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">16</p> <p>1 qualitative considerations go into that. But</p> <p>2 substantially completed.</p> <p>3 Q. Sitting here today, do you think or believe</p> <p>4 that any portion of your compensation over the next</p> <p>5 however long it takes to wind down Highland depends on</p> <p>6 how much Highland recovers from the litigation</p> <p>7 regarding promissory notes?</p> <p>8 A. I really take exception to that question</p> <p>9 because the insinuation is that it's going to somehow</p> <p>10 change my answers here, and it's absolutely not.</p> <p>11 How litigation, it may or may not affect my</p> <p>12 ultimate compensation, but that's not going to affect</p> <p>13 one iota of the answers I give you today or at any</p> <p>14 time, whether I'm on or off the record.</p> <p>15 Q. Fair enough. So you're going to testify</p> <p>16 today truthfully regardless of your compensation. I</p> <p>17 got you; right? Correct?</p> <p>18 A. I didn't follow what you just asked me.</p> <p>19 Q. You're going to testify today truthfully</p> <p>20 regardless of how these events may or may not affect</p> <p>21 your compensation; right?</p> <p>22 A. It's such a loaded question I can't even</p> <p>23 begin to answer that.</p> <p>24 Q. So sitting here today -- I want to ask you</p> <p>25 the same question I did before, and your answer to me</p>

David Klos - October 27, 2021

<p style="text-align: right;">17</p> <p>1 was that you took exception to the insinuation. Now</p> <p>2 I'd like you to answer my question.</p> <p>3 Which is, sitting here today, do you believe</p> <p>4 that any part of your compensation in the future,</p> <p>5 however long it takes to wind down Highland, is going</p> <p>6 to depend on how well Highland does in these</p> <p>7 litigations concerning the notes?</p> <p>8 A. I believe my ultimate compensation will</p> <p>9 depend on how long this process takes, which I don't</p> <p>10 know, and ultimate recoveries to trust beneficiaries</p> <p>11 under the plan.</p> <p>12 And so I do expect that it will vary, but I</p> <p>13 would reiterate my earlier comment.</p> <p>14 Q. So sitting here today, you understand that if</p> <p>15 the trust beneficiaries recover more, then you might be</p> <p>16 compensated more?</p> <p>17 A. That's possible.</p> <p>18 Q. Well, sir, I'm not trying to be a smart ass,</p> <p>19 but --</p> <p>20 MR. MORRIS: Actually, you're coming awfully</p> <p>21 close, just to be clear, so be careful, because I'm</p> <p>22 offended as well. But continue.</p> <p>23 MR. RUKAVINA: I'm entitled to ask the man</p> <p>24 about his compensation.</p> <p>25 MR. MORRIS: Right. And your clients have</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">19</p> <p>1 A. Not in any substance.</p> <p>2 Q. And when do you recall you might have had</p> <p>3 those discussions with her?</p> <p>4 A. I'm not even sure.</p> <p>5 Q. Would it have been recently or like 9,</p> <p>6 10 months ago?</p> <p>7 A. No, it would have been recently.</p> <p>8 Q. And with Mr. Seery, when did you have a</p> <p>9 general conversation with Mr. Seery?</p> <p>10 A. I've had, you know, one or more general</p> <p>11 conversations with Mr. Seery. It's my understanding</p> <p>12 that he was the 30(b)(6) witness, and he had questions</p> <p>13 in preparation for his role in that.</p> <p>14 Q. So that would have been before last Thursday</p> <p>15 that you talked to him? I'll represent to you that</p> <p>16 that's when his deposition was.</p> <p>17 A. Yeah, if I'm accepting that representation,</p> <p>18 yes, prior to.</p> <p>19 Q. Other than that conversation with respect to</p> <p>20 him preparing for the 30(b)(6), did you have a</p> <p>21 discussion with him about this litigation as it might</p> <p>22 relate to your deposition?</p> <p>23 A. I don't believe so in terms of relating to</p> <p>24 this deposition. We've talked at length about the</p> <p>25 notes more generally.</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">18</p> <p>1 \$75 million, hard dollars at stake in this litigation,</p> <p>2 so we should never believe anything that he says? Is</p> <p>3 that where we are now?</p> <p>4 Q. (BY MR. RUKAVINA) Sir, again, what is your</p> <p>5 bonus compensation as it relates to how well the</p> <p>6 claimant trust does? Do you remember or not?</p> <p>7 A. I don't know that that's even something that</p> <p>8 I could know at this point.</p> <p>9 Q. In preparing for this deposition, I take it</p> <p>10 you spoke to legal counsel, and I'm not entitled to</p> <p>11 know that and I'm not asking that.</p> <p>12 But did you talk to anyone else?</p> <p>13 A. I've spoken in general terms to Mr. Seery.</p> <p>14 Q. Okay. Anyone else?</p> <p>15 A. I've spoken, again in general terms, to</p> <p>16 Kristin Hendrix.</p> <p>17 Q. Anyone else?</p> <p>18 A. Not that I can think of.</p> <p>19 Q. Now, I understand you spoke to Ms. Hendrix</p> <p>20 when legal counsel was present; right?</p> <p>21 A. Yes.</p> <p>22 Q. So let's exclude that conversation.</p> <p>23 Did you have any conversations with</p> <p>24 Ms. Hendrix regarding this deposition or this</p> <p>25 litigation at which counsel was not present?</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">20</p> <p>1 Q. And we'll go through that I'm sure.</p> <p>2 So other than the conversations with</p> <p>3 Ms. Hendrix and Mr. Seery and, of course, with counsel</p> <p>4 that I'm not entitled to know about, did you discuss</p> <p>5 this deposition or what you might be asked today with</p> <p>6 anyone else?</p> <p>7 A. No.</p> <p>8 Q. Okay. Did you read all or any portions of</p> <p>9 the deposition of Frank Waterhouse?</p> <p>10 A. Certainly didn't read all of it. I have a</p> <p>11 general understanding of the topics that were -- that's</p> <p>12 a bad way to frame it.</p> <p>13 I have a general understanding of a few</p> <p>14 points that were covered in his deposition.</p> <p>15 Q. Were you provided -- were you provided the</p> <p>16 exact pages of any of his deposition?</p> <p>17 MR. MORRIS: Objection. Direct him not to</p> <p>18 answer.</p> <p>19 MR. RUKAVINA: You're going to direct him not</p> <p>20 to answer whether he read --</p> <p>21 MR. MORRIS: If you're asking him whether I</p> <p>22 directed him to particular --</p> <p>23 MR. RUKAVINA: I didn't ask that.</p> <p>24 MR. MORRIS: Rephrase your question.</p> <p>25 Q. (BY MR. RUKAVINA) Did you read any pages</p>

David Klos - October 27, 2021

<p style="text-align: right;">21</p> <p>1 from Mr. Waterhouse's deposition?</p> <p>2 MR. MORRIS: Objection. Asked and answered.</p> <p>3 You can answer again.</p> <p>4 THE WITNESS: I don't recall -- I don't</p> <p>5 recall reading it.</p> <p>6 Q. (BY MR. RUKAVINA) So were you provided a</p> <p>7 summary of his deposition?</p> <p>8 A. I have had discussions with Mr. Morris in</p> <p>9 preparation for this deposition.</p> <p>10 Q. That's fine. And we can stop there.</p> <p>11 Did you read or -- did you read the whole or</p> <p>12 any portion of Mr. Seery's deposition?</p> <p>13 A. No, I don't believe I -- no, I don't believe</p> <p>14 so.</p> <p>15 Q. Is it the same answer, that whatever you</p> <p>16 discussed would have been through counsel?</p> <p>17 A. Yes.</p> <p>18 Q. Did you see any of the videotape of either</p> <p>19 Mr. Waterhouse's or Mr. Seery's deposition?</p> <p>20 A. No.</p> <p>21 Q. So let's talk about the NexPoint</p> <p>22 \$30.7 million note.</p> <p>23 You're familiar with that note; right?</p> <p>24 MR. MORRIS: Objection to the form of the</p> <p>25 question.</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">23</p> <p>1 was?</p> <p>2 A. Yeah, it was Lauren Thedford, who is Highland</p> <p>3 in-house counsel.</p> <p>4 Q. She's a lawyer?</p> <p>5 A. Yes.</p> <p>6 Q. Do you recall from that -- strike that.</p> <p>7 Did you know on or about May 31, 2017 what</p> <p>8 the purpose or reason behind Exhibit 13, this</p> <p>9 promissory note, was?</p> <p>10 MR. MORRIS: Objection to the form of the</p> <p>11 question.</p> <p>12 THE WITNESS: The purpose was to take</p> <p>13 existing notes, which I believe were exclusively demand</p> <p>14 notes, I'm not a hundred percent certain on that, and</p> <p>15 roll them into a single note that would have a 30-year</p> <p>16 amortization period.</p> <p>17 Q. (BY MR. RUKAVINA) Do you know why that was</p> <p>18 done?</p> <p>19 A. I believe it was done probably for a number</p> <p>20 of reasons, one of which was to ensure some level of</p> <p>21 cash flow back to Highland, when I say Highland,</p> <p>22 Highland Capital Management, LP, on an annual basis.</p> <p>23 Q. Was that a concern at Highland Capital</p> <p>24 Management, that it wasn't getting any level of cash</p> <p>25 flow back?</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">22</p> <p>1 THE WITNESS: Before I answer that, I'd like</p> <p>2 to see the note.</p> <p>3 Q. (BY MR. RUKAVINA) It's in here. I'm looking</p> <p>4 for the exhibit number. It's in here somewhere.</p> <p>5 A. Yes, I'm familiar with this note.</p> <p>6 Q. Are you familiar with anything having to do</p> <p>7 with the negotiation or execution of this note?</p> <p>8 MR. MORRIS: Objection to the form of the</p> <p>9 question.</p> <p>10 THE WITNESS: Can you repeat.</p> <p>11 Q. (BY MR. RUKAVINA) Yes. Let me rephrase it.</p> <p>12 Did you have anything to do, back on or about</p> <p>13 May 31, 2017, with the negotiation or execution of this</p> <p>14 promissory note?</p> <p>15 MR. MORRIS: Objection to the form of the</p> <p>16 question.</p> <p>17 THE WITNESS: Nothing with respect to the</p> <p>18 negotiation --</p> <p>19 Q. (BY MR. RUKAVINA) I'm sorry.</p> <p>20 A. In terms of the execution, I believe I</p> <p>21 coordinated with internal counsel, who drafted the</p> <p>22 note, and I can't remember -- I can't recall one way or</p> <p>23 the other if I assisted in actually physically</p> <p>24 receiving signatures. I just don't remember.</p> <p>25 Q. Do you remember who that internal counsel</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">24</p> <p>1 A. It wasn't a concern of mine. I don't know if</p> <p>2 it was a concern of others.</p> <p>3 Q. Do you recall whether any auditor ever raised</p> <p>4 that concern?</p> <p>5 A. The auditors did raise that in conjunction</p> <p>6 with the audit that was concluding around this time.</p> <p>7 So yes, they did raise it, you know, probably in the</p> <p>8 May of 2017 time frame.</p> <p>9 Q. Do you know who decided that it would be a</p> <p>10 30-year term note? By that I mean 30 years.</p> <p>11 A. Jim Dondero.</p> <p>12 Q. Do you know if he decided that in connection</p> <p>13 with discussions with anybody or, to your knowledge, he</p> <p>14 just decided?</p> <p>15 A. As far as I know he just decided it. I</p> <p>16 believe there was a draft at one point that was for</p> <p>17 20 years, and he wanted to do 30.</p> <p>18 Q. So this note is executed in May 31, 2017.</p> <p>19 Did you have any further role prior to, let's say,</p> <p>20 December 1, 2020 with respect to anything to do with</p> <p>21 this promissory note?</p> <p>22 A. Sorry, tell me the date again.</p> <p>23 Q. From execution of the note until December 1,</p> <p>24 2020?</p> <p>25 A. And the question was?</p>

David Klos - October 27, 2021

<p style="text-align: right;">25</p> <p>1 Q. Did you have any role in that time frame with 2 respect to this promissory note on behalf of Highland? 3 MR. MORRIS: Objection to the form of the 4 question. 5 THE WITNESS: I don't know how to answer 6 that, it's such an open-ended question. I just don't 7 know how to respond to that. 8 Q. (BY MR. RUKAVINA) If payments were made on 9 this note, would you have any duty to record or credit 10 those payments? 11 MR. MORRIS: Objection to the form of the 12 question. 13 THE WITNESS: I wouldn't have personally in 14 my role, but my team would have been involved in the 15 recording of those. 16 Q. (BY MR. RUKAVINA) And when payments were due 17 on this note, did you personally have any role with 18 respect to doing anything to facilitate those payments? 19 A. When payments were due did I have anything -- 20 yes. 21 Q. What was your role? 22 A. So my role, as part of the corporate team, 23 part of our role is managing cash at the various 24 entities. So I was involved in weekly cash meetings, 25 where things like upcoming, whether it's an obligation</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">27</p> <p>1 Capital Management or NexPoint Advisors as to a 2 decision as to whether any prepayments on this note 3 would ever be made? 4 MR. MORRIS: Objection to the form of the 5 question. 6 THE WITNESS: Can you repeat. 7 Q. (BY MR. RUKAVINA) Let's start from scratch. 8 Do you have any memory of any payments being 9 made on this note, Exhibit 13, prior to their scheduled 10 dates of payment? 11 A. There were payments on -- and to be clear, 12 we're talking about the original 30.7- NexPoint 13 promissory note? There were payments that I recall 14 happening throughout 2019 on this note. 15 Q. And we can look at Exhibit 14. 16 MR. MORRIS: What number? 17 MR. RUKAVINA: 14, 1-4. 18 Q. (BY MR. RUKAVINA) And those are only 19 numbered because Ms. Hendrix, they were used for her 20 deposition. 21 A. Sure. Just trying to keep these in order, I 22 apologize. Got it. 23 Q. Do you recognize Exhibit 14? 24 A. Generally. I can't say that I can verify 25 that this is completely accurate. But it looks</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">26</p> <p>1 or a receipt, would be put on people's radars. 2 And we would, in connection with the 30-year 3 notes such as this one from NexPoint, we would either 4 confer with Jim or -- certainly Jim. Also likely his 5 accountant. 6 In terms of teeing them up to make sure that 7 they were prepared from a cash flow statement to make 8 the payment. 9 Q. What do you mean by his accountant? 10 A. Melissa Schroth. 11 Q. What do you mean by his? That's a new name 12 to me. Who is Melissa Schroth? 13 A. I find it hard to believe that she's a new 14 name to you. But I think her title was executive 15 accountant, and she was the keeper of Jim's -- many of 16 Jim's trusts and personal entities. 17 Q. Was she a Highland employee? 18 A. She was. And when I say Highland, I should 19 be clear, Highland Capital Management, LP. 20 Q. So when you say Jim's accountant, she was 21 still a debtor employee, just that she handled 22 primarily Jim's personal matters? 23 A. She was still a Highland Capital Management, 24 LP employee but she did Jim's personal matters. 25 Q. Did you have any role at either Highland</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">28</p> <p>1 familiar to a loan amortization schedule. 2 Q. Would it have been maintained by Highland? 3 A. Yes. 4 Q. And I'll tell you that no one has yet to 5 authenticate this with a hundred percent precision, so 6 I'm not asking you to ratify these numbers, but let's 7 assume that they are what they are. 8 This does purport to show on the second page 9 a number of transfers in 2019, which goes along with 10 your recent answer. 11 Do you see those, sir? 12 A. I do. 13 Q. In particular, 750,000, then 1.3 million, 14 300,000, 2.1 million, 630,000, 1.3 million. 15 You see all those, sir? 16 A. Yes, I see every one. 17 Q. Do you have any memory, without going into 18 those transfers of those dates to the dollar, do you 19 have any memory that those transfers were made? 20 A. Yes. Again, not a specific recollection of 21 where I was at the time, but yes, I know that these 22 transfers were made. 23 Q. Do you know why they were made in those 24 amounts and on those dates? 25 A. No, not without speculating.</p>

David Klos - October 27, 2021

<p style="text-align: right;">29</p> <p>1 Q. What would be your speculation if you were to 2 speculate?</p> <p>3 A. My speculation would be that it would be for 4 liquidity needs at HCMLP, Highland Capital Management, 5 LP, needing liquidity to operate. Again, that's 6 speculation. I don't know for a fact that that's true, 7 but that's what I would assume.</p> <p>8 Q. Who would have made those decisions in 2019 9 to transfer those funds?</p> <p>10 MR. MORRIS: Objection to the form of the 11 question.</p> <p>12 THE WITNESS: Yeah, it would have been either 13 Frank or Jim. I can't say with certainty, but one of 14 the two. When I say Jim, I should be clear, 15 Mr. Dondero.</p> <p>16 Q. (BY MR. RUKAVINA) Between January and 17 July 2019, do you have any recollection that there was 18 any particular liquidity issue or need at Highland 19 Capital Management?</p> <p>20 A. Yeah, Highland was dealing with liquidity 21 problems throughout 2019. Maybe not every single day 22 of the year, but we were continuously needing to bridge 23 liquidity.</p> <p>24 Q. And you joined Highland in 2009. From that 25 point in time, 2009, through 2019, was there any</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">31</p> <p>1 them had been made and you executed them?</p> <p>2 A. Both, depending on the circumstances.</p> <p>3 Q. So sometimes you would be brought into a 4 discussion?</p> <p>5 A. Yes.</p> <p>6 Q. And can you think of any particular example?</p> <p>7 A. Of when I was brought into the discussion of 8 whether to transfer? I can't think of an individual 9 example but we met quite regularly with Jim on cash. 10 So to the extent that either he needed cash 11 on one of his entities, he might let us know that. Or 12 to the extent that Highland needed cash, we might let 13 him know that and ask for basically his assistance in 14 helping us to meet our own cash needs.</p> <p>15 Q. And did he usually find a way to facilitate 16 the cash need either at one of his entities or at 17 Highland?</p> <p>18 A. I suppose until October 16 of 2019.</p> <p>19 Q. Yes. Prior to bankruptcy, do you recall any 20 instance where one entity wasn't able to transfer funds 21 to another for liquidity purposes?</p> <p>22 A. I can't think of a specific situation. But 23 I'm sure there were situations where -- you know, cash 24 was always something that was being juggled, so I don't 25 know that necessarily liquidity could be met the same</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">30</p> <p>1 practice at the enterprise of those businesses to 2 transfer funds between each other on a basis of when 3 one needed it and one had it?</p> <p>4 A. Yes, that was a fairly, generally speaking, 5 that was a fairly common practice, of using different 6 entities within the overall structure to bridge 7 liquidity.</p> <p>8 Q. Would that have been Mr. Dondero who, in the 9 final analysis, would have made those decisions?</p> <p>10 A. Maybe not a hundred percent, but I'd say 11 the -- if not a hundred percent, certainly most.</p> <p>12 Q. And who else might have participated, 13 Mr. Waterhouse?</p> <p>14 A. Potentially Mr. Waterhouse. And the reason I 15 hedge on that a little bit is I don't think Frank would 16 have made any of these decisions on his own either. 17 But I may have heard them from Frank via Jim.</p> <p>18 Q. So in those same years, were you ever asked 19 by Mr. Dondero or Mr. Waterhouse as to whether funds 20 should be transferred from one entity to another for 21 liquidity purposes?</p> <p>22 A. Can you ask that again, please.</p> <p>23 Q. Yes. Trying to understand, were you part of 24 those discussions as to whether these transfers should 25 be made, or did you just learn that a decision to make</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">32</p> <p>1 day.</p> <p>2 But eventually we were able to manage through 3 those situations, you know, oftentimes through some of 4 these loans.</p> <p>5 Q. In instances that you may remember when 6 Highland Capital Management needed liquidity, do you 7 know how Mr. Dondero decided from which other entity to 8 transfer the cash?</p> <p>9 A. I can't step into his brain and think about 10 his decision-making process, but if I was going to 11 oversimplify it I would speculate that it would be 12 based on who has cash in that moment.</p> <p>13 Q. Would he ask you or someone on your team who 14 had cash?</p> <p>15 A. At times, depending on which entity we're 16 talking about. Because my team certainly didn't have 17 responsibility for every single entity in the 18 enterprise, but we did have responsibility for some.</p> <p>19 Q. And if your team -- so -- strike that.</p> <p>20 So over the general -- talking about 21 generally now, over those 10 years when there were 22 these intercompany transfers for liquidity purposes, 23 how were they booked by the debtor, by Highland Capital 24 Management?</p> <p>25 MR. MORRIS: Objection to the form of the</p>

David Klos - October 27, 2021

<p style="text-align: right;">33</p> <p>1 question.</p> <p>2 THE WITNESS: Help me on the direction. So</p> <p>3 this is money that Highland is receiving or money that</p> <p>4 Highland is sending?</p> <p>5 Q. (BY MR. RUKAVINA) Sending out.</p> <p>6 A. Sending out. So this is -- in the scenario</p> <p>7 that you're describing, this money that Highland is</p> <p>8 sending out to meet some other corporate obligor's</p> <p>9 liquidity needs?</p> <p>10 Q. Yes, sir.</p> <p>11 A. So those would be booked as a loan. I</p> <p>12 would -- I need to hedge a little bit because I'm not</p> <p>13 a hundred percent certain, but I would say if not</p> <p>14 exclusively via loans close to exclusively.</p> <p>15 Q. And would they -- strike that.</p> <p>16 Would they usually be papered up with a</p> <p>17 promissory note?</p> <p>18 A. Yes.</p> <p>19 Q. Now, why was that the general course during</p> <p>20 10 years? Was there a policy and procedure in place,</p> <p>21 or would Dondero say book it as a loan, or was that</p> <p>22 just the right thing to do from an accounting</p> <p>23 perspective?</p> <p>24 MR. MORRIS: Objection to the form of the</p> <p>25 question.</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">35</p> <p>1 Q. (BY MR. RUKAVINA) To your knowledge, was</p> <p>2 there any written policy or procedure in place at</p> <p>3 Highland Capital Management with respect to how</p> <p>4 transfers from Highland to an affiliated entity should</p> <p>5 be booked or treated?</p> <p>6 A. No written policy or procedure that I'm aware</p> <p>7 of.</p> <p>8 Q. Is it fair to say that by May 2019, the</p> <p>9 corporate accounting group had handled so many of these</p> <p>10 transfers that it believed that if Highland was</p> <p>11 transferring funds to another affiliated entity, it's</p> <p>12 probably a loan?</p> <p>13 MR. MORRIS: Objection to the form of the</p> <p>14 question.</p> <p>15 THE WITNESS: Yeah, I don't know that I can</p> <p>16 answer that in terms of the corporate accounting team.</p> <p>17 That just feels way too broad.</p> <p>18 It was certainly the practice that when</p> <p>19 somebody needed liquidity and it was appropriate from an</p> <p>20 accounting perspective, that's how it would be booked.</p> <p>21 And there was no reason to doubt that that was</p> <p>22 the appropriate way to do it, particularly with</p> <p>23 direction from either Frank or Jim.</p> <p>24 Q. (BY MR. RUKAVINA) Is it your testimony that</p> <p>25 in each instance that happened, that either Frank or</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">34</p> <p>1 THE WITNESS: At the end of the day it's at</p> <p>2 the direction of Jim Dondero, so I can't tell you</p> <p>3 exactly why he wanted it to be done that way. But that</p> <p>4 was certainly the practice of how it was done in those</p> <p>5 situations.</p> <p>6 Q. (BY MR. RUKAVINA) To your knowledge, did Jim</p> <p>7 Dondero ever tell you or anyone else that when Highland</p> <p>8 is transferring funds to one of his affiliated entities</p> <p>9 that it should always be booked as a loan?</p> <p>10 A. So remembering 10 years' worth of</p> <p>11 conversations, I can't remember a specific instance</p> <p>12 where he would have said, always book every single</p> <p>13 transaction I direct you to do as a loan. However,</p> <p>14 that was the practice.</p> <p>15 Q. Different question.</p> <p>16 Do you remember that in each instance, and</p> <p>17 again, that might be unfair over 10 years, but do you</p> <p>18 remember in each instance when Mr. Dondero said</p> <p>19 transfer money from Highland to this other entity for</p> <p>20 liquidity needs that he said book it as a loan?</p> <p>21 MR. MORRIS: Objection to the form of the</p> <p>22 question.</p> <p>23 THE WITNESS: I can't recall with any</p> <p>24 specificity what he may or may not have specifically</p> <p>25 said so long ago.</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">36</p> <p>1 Jim said, this is a loan, the "this" being the transfer</p> <p>2 from Highland to an affiliated entity for liquidity</p> <p>3 purposes?</p> <p>4 MR. MORRIS: Objection to the form of the</p> <p>5 question.</p> <p>6 THE WITNESS: I can't recall with that level</p> <p>7 of specificity if those words came out of Jim's mouth.</p> <p>8 But with 0 percent doubt in my mind, every single one</p> <p>9 of those loans was done with the authority of Jim or</p> <p>10 Frank, or both.</p> <p>11 Q. (BY MR. RUKAVINA) So going back to this</p> <p>12 Exhibit 14, now I'm going to ask you about these</p> <p>13 payments coming in.</p> <p>14 Assuming that these payments were actually</p> <p>15 made in 2019 --</p> <p>16 And I think, John, you sent me this morning,</p> <p>17 or maybe last night, some bank statements?</p> <p>18 MR. MORRIS: I actually sent all of the</p> <p>19 backup for all payments made, I think, under the notes</p> <p>20 at issue a week or two ago.</p> <p>21 Q. (BY MR. RUKAVINA) How would -- so assuming</p> <p>22 that these payments in 2019 that NexPoint made didn't</p> <p>23 technically have to be made at that point in time, how</p> <p>24 would Highland have booked these payments?</p> <p>25 A. So I can't tell the column headers, so you'll</p>

David Klos - October 27, 2021

<p style="text-align: right;">37</p> <p>1 have to excuse me if I flip them.</p> <p>2 Q. They'll be on the first page. Rip the page</p> <p>3 off if you need to.</p> <p>4 A. First one is interest, second one is</p> <p>5 principal. On the far right is the actual amount of</p> <p>6 the payment. So, for example, March 29, 750,000.</p> <p>7 And the -- the column that has the negative</p> <p>8 411,000 is the application of interest and the 338- is</p> <p>9 the application of principal.</p> <p>10 Q. So again, if Highland -- strike that.</p> <p>11 If NexPoint made a payment that was not</p> <p>12 technically due at that point in time, it would be</p> <p>13 recorded as payments on principal and interest?</p> <p>14 A. It would be recorded as it's reflected in the</p> <p>15 schedule. So there's an application of interest and an</p> <p>16 application of principal.</p> <p>17 Q. So based on your understanding and</p> <p>18 experience, if that payment wasn't due at that time,</p> <p>19 would it have been a prepayment by NexPoint?</p> <p>20 MR. MORRIS: Objection to the form of the</p> <p>21 question.</p> <p>22 THE WITNESS: Yeah, I'm not sure that it's a</p> <p>23 prepayment or not. It's certainly a payment. It's</p> <p>24 certainly voluntary. It's not spelled out under the</p> <p>25 schedule. I don't know that it's a per se, capital P,</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">39</p> <p>1 question.</p> <p>2 Q. (BY MR. RUKAVINA) And his objection is</p> <p>3 valid. And just to give you a little bit of a fine</p> <p>4 point, does someone look at the promissory note to</p> <p>5 decide that? Or is there some other rule or procedure</p> <p>6 that someone looks at?</p> <p>7 MR. MORRIS: Objection to the form of the</p> <p>8 question.</p> <p>9 THE WITNESS: So the person -- I don't know</p> <p>10 that I can specifically name a person because the role</p> <p>11 probably changed over time.</p> <p>12 But either our corporate accountant, or the</p> <p>13 corporate accountant's boss, which was Kristin Hendrix</p> <p>14 for years, would have been responsible for recording and</p> <p>15 tracking those payments.</p> <p>16 So some combination of the corporate</p> <p>17 accountant and Kristin would have applied those</p> <p>18 payments, and that rolls up through my and Frank's</p> <p>19 review ultimately.</p> <p>20 Q. (BY MR. RUKAVINA) So if I can round off this</p> <p>21 discussion, I think you told me a few minutes ago that</p> <p>22 in each instance that Highland was transferring money</p> <p>23 out to an affiliate.</p> <p>24 Whether or not you remember Dondero or</p> <p>25 Waterhouse saying it's a loan, it would have been a</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">38</p> <p>1 prepayment. I'm just not certain.</p> <p>2 Q. (BY MR. RUKAVINA) Well, maybe without</p> <p>3 respect to these specific transfers.</p> <p>4 Generally, generally, if one of the Dondero</p> <p>5 affiliates made a payment that wasn't scheduled, how</p> <p>6 would the debtor have accounted for that payment?</p> <p>7 A. It would have recorded the payment as a</p> <p>8 reduction to either or both outstanding accrued</p> <p>9 interest or principal.</p> <p>10 Q. You wouldn't call those prepayments?</p> <p>11 A. I don't know the definition of prepayment.</p> <p>12 It's a payment. It's off schedule, but I don't know</p> <p>13 whether it's a per se prepayment.</p> <p>14 Q. Would that be something in your experience</p> <p>15 that we would look at the promissory note to maybe</p> <p>16 determine?</p> <p>17 MR. MORRIS: Objection to the form of the</p> <p>18 question.</p> <p>19 THE WITNESS: I don't know.</p> <p>20 Q. (BY MR. RUKAVINA) Well, remember, I'm asking</p> <p>21 you the same question just in different ways.</p> <p>22 Who decides at the debtor, or how does the</p> <p>23 debtor decide, if an unscheduled payment is made, how</p> <p>24 to apply it?</p> <p>25 MR. MORRIS: Objection to the form of the</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">40</p> <p>1 loan because that's how it always was and it was always</p> <p>2 authorized. Generally correct?</p> <p>3 MR. MORRIS: Objection to the form of the</p> <p>4 question.</p> <p>5 THE WITNESS: There were a few "always" and</p> <p>6 "generally" in there. And like I said, when it came</p> <p>7 to liquidity needs, my recollection is that these would</p> <p>8 be handled via loans.</p> <p>9 Q. (BY MR. RUKAVINA) And in reverse, if a</p> <p>10 Dondero entity made a payment prior to a scheduled</p> <p>11 payment on a note, generally there would be credit</p> <p>12 against principal and/or interest provided on that</p> <p>13 note?</p> <p>14 MR. MORRIS: Objection to the form of the</p> <p>15 question.</p> <p>16 THE WITNESS: Generally speaking, yes, if the</p> <p>17 payment was for payment on the note.</p> <p>18 Q. (BY MR. RUKAVINA) Well, that goes back to my</p> <p>19 question.</p> <p>20 Do you know how these payments on Exhibit 14</p> <p>21 in 2019 were determined to be payments on these notes,</p> <p>22 as opposed to a transfer from NexPoint to Highland for</p> <p>23 some other reason?</p> <p>24 A. What other reason would it be, if I can be so</p> <p>25 bold.</p>

David Klos - October 27, 2021

<p style="text-align: right;">41</p> <p>1 Q. Can you think of any other reason in 2019?</p> <p>2 A. Well, Highland had -- Highland had shared</p> <p>3 services and intercompany agreements with NexPoint, at</p> <p>4 this time.</p> <p>5 But these were not payments that could</p> <p>6 possibly be confused with those payments. These are</p> <p>7 off cycle, they're larger amounts, and there's nothing</p> <p>8 that they could be other than payments against the</p> <p>9 loan.</p> <p>10 Q. So I asked you before, and I think you said</p> <p>11 that you were speculating with respect to these</p> <p>12 payments, that Highland needed money at that time.</p> <p>13 Do you recall in 2019 any discussions with</p> <p>14 anyone, Dondero or Waterhouse, to the effect that</p> <p>15 NexPoint has excess cash so maybe NexPoint should</p> <p>16 transfer some money to Highland?</p> <p>17 MR. MORRIS: Objection. Asked and answered.</p> <p>18 THE WITNESS: Do I still answer?</p> <p>19 Q. (BY MR. RUKAVINA) Yes.</p> <p>20 MR. MORRIS: Yes.</p> <p>21 THE WITNESS: And sorry, I got lost there.</p> <p>22 Q. (BY MR. RUKAVINA) Yes. So my predicate was</p> <p>23 you testified before that you were assuming that these</p> <p>24 payments were because of a cash need at Highland;</p> <p>25 right?</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">43</p> <p>1 THE WITNESS: Yeah, the premise of that,</p> <p>2 given that Mr. Dondero is in control of both sides,</p> <p>3 it's a faulty premise.</p> <p>4 Q. (BY MR. RUKAVINA) But you told me not that</p> <p>5 long ago that in these weekly cash meetings that it</p> <p>6 would be your team at Highland who would go to</p> <p>7 Mr. Dondero and say Highland has a liquidity issue.</p> <p>8 So wouldn't that liquidity issue have</p> <p>9 originated with the Highland team?</p> <p>10 A. Mr. Dondero is the president of Highland.</p> <p>11 He's the president of NexPoint. We're employees of</p> <p>12 Highland. We're also shared services providers for</p> <p>13 NexPoint.</p> <p>14 The waters are very muddy in terms of who is</p> <p>15 wearing what hat in that conversation.</p> <p>16 Q. But Mr. Dondero doesn't know that Highland</p> <p>17 has a liquidity issue unless someone from the corporate</p> <p>18 accounting group tells him, does he?</p> <p>19 MR. MORRIS: Objection to the form of the</p> <p>20 question. I hope that's not the case.</p> <p>21 THE WITNESS: He has the ability to know what</p> <p>22 our cash position is at any given time, at that time.</p> <p>23 Q. (BY MR. RUKAVINA) So why would you have</p> <p>24 these weekly cash meetings with Mr. Waterhouse and</p> <p>25 sometimes Mr. Dondero?</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">42</p> <p>1 A. Correct.</p> <p>2 Q. So with that predicate my question is, do you</p> <p>3 recall discussing with Dondero or Waterhouse or with</p> <p>4 anyone as to why NexPoint would be transferring money</p> <p>5 to Highland at that time?</p> <p>6 A. Yes, I would have had conversations with</p> <p>7 Mr. Dondero or Mr. Waterhouse.</p> <p>8 Q. And do you remember specifically in 2019 why</p> <p>9 these transfers were made from NexPoint as opposed to</p> <p>10 some other Dondero entity?</p> <p>11 A. Not with specificity, but certainly NexPoint</p> <p>12 was generating cash at that time, and had the ability</p> <p>13 to assist with Highland's liquidity.</p> <p>14 Q. So sitting here today, you've told me</p> <p>15 generally and logically that you have no specific</p> <p>16 memory why between January 2019 and August 2019, any of</p> <p>17 these payments on Exhibit 14 were made by NexPoint?</p> <p>18 A. I have no specific memory, but I would say</p> <p>19 with certainty that most or all of this was driven by</p> <p>20 Highland HCMLP liquidity needs.</p> <p>21 Q. And most or all of this would have been</p> <p>22 Highland in the first instance going to NexPoint and</p> <p>23 saying, hey, can you send us some cash?</p> <p>24 MR. MORRIS: Objection to the form of the</p> <p>25 question.</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">44</p> <p>1 A. So these were cash forecasts, looking at</p> <p>2 outlook. I can tell you almost without exception,</p> <p>3 maybe -- with maybe without exception, be speculating,</p> <p>4 but those forecasts would be showing negative numbers</p> <p>5 at Highland, virtually nonstop.</p> <p>6 And so it was important, my opinion, but it</p> <p>7 was probably important to Frank to make sure that he</p> <p>8 was getting in front of Jim to make sure that those</p> <p>9 needs were being addressed timely.</p> <p>10 Q. So I've asked that question. I want to ask</p> <p>11 you a different question.</p> <p>12 For any of these payments between</p> <p>13 January 2019 and August 2019 reflected on Exhibit 14,</p> <p>14 do you have any personal knowledge as to whether they</p> <p>15 were intended to be prepayments or not?</p> <p>16 MR. MORRIS: Objection to the form of the</p> <p>17 question.</p> <p>18 THE WITNESS: I don't know whether they were</p> <p>19 intended to be prepayments at that time.</p> <p>20 Q. (BY MR. RUKAVINA) Sitting here today, seeing</p> <p>21 this document as a CPA and as a sophisticated person,</p> <p>22 do you read this Exhibit 14 to indicate that those</p> <p>23 payments were booked as prepayments?</p> <p>24 MR. MORRIS: Objection to the form of the</p> <p>25 question.</p>

David Klos - October 27, 2021

<p style="text-align: right;">45</p> <p>1 THE WITNESS: Again, the term "prepayments"</p> <p>2 is the one I'm struggling with. I can ascertain that</p> <p>3 there are payments and they're off schedule. But I</p> <p>4 don't know that I can ascertain that they're</p> <p>5 prepayments.</p> <p>6 Q. (BY MR. RUKAVINA) Well, if a borrower makes</p> <p>7 a payment that's ahead of schedule, how would that</p> <p>8 generally be accounted for?</p> <p>9 MR. MORRIS: Objection to the form of the</p> <p>10 question.</p> <p>11 THE WITNESS: It would be accounted for as a</p> <p>12 reduction of principal or interest or some combination</p> <p>13 of the two.</p> <p>14 Q. (BY MR. RUKAVINA) Which would relieve the</p> <p>15 borrower of having to make that at some point in the</p> <p>16 future; right?</p> <p>17 MR. MORRIS: Objection to the form of the</p> <p>18 question.</p> <p>19 THE WITNESS: No. The borrower still owes</p> <p>20 the money. This is showing 23-point -- pick a date.</p> <p>21 May 31, 23.034-. That there's significant obligations</p> <p>22 that are still outstanding.</p> <p>23 Q. (BY MR. RUKAVINA) So on June 4, 2019 -- I'm</p> <p>24 sorry, on June 19, 2019, the borrower made a</p> <p>25 \$2.1 million payment. That's what this shows; correct?</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">47</p> <p>1 that the maker may pay outstanding accrued interest, or</p> <p>2 unpaid principal.</p> <p>3 Q. (BY MR. RUKAVINA) But my question is, as I</p> <p>4 understand accrued interest, it means interest that has</p> <p>5 already occurred or accrued as of the date, like</p> <p>6 today's date; right?</p> <p>7 A. Uh-huh.</p> <p>8 MR. MORRIS: Objection to the form of the</p> <p>9 question.</p> <p>10 Q. (BY MR. RUKAVINA) Do you agree with that?</p> <p>11 Do you agree with that? Accrued interest</p> <p>12 means interest that has already come due, that has</p> <p>13 actually happened because interest happens over time.</p> <p>14 A. Accrued interest --</p> <p>15 MR. MORRIS: Objection to the form of the</p> <p>16 question.</p> <p>17 Q. (BY MR. RUKAVINA) Why don't you start. Why</p> <p>18 don't you define for me accrued interest.</p> <p>19 A. Sure. Accrued interest would be outstanding</p> <p>20 and unpaid interest that -- sorry, it's hard to define</p> <p>21 it without using the term. But it's interest that's</p> <p>22 accumulated in respect of a principal amount through a</p> <p>23 given date.</p> <p>24 Q. So how do you prepay accrued interest?</p> <p>25 A. How do you prepay accrued interest. Again,</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">46</p> <p>1 A. I see that.</p> <p>2 Q. You're not saying that the borrower would</p> <p>3 ever have to make that same \$2.1 million payment again,</p> <p>4 are you?</p> <p>5 A. No. What I'm saying is, based on that 2.1-</p> <p>6 payment -- and this is reading this cold.</p> <p>7 But based on that 2.1- payment, 66,000 was</p> <p>8 applied to interest, which left zero accrued interest</p> <p>9 outstanding. 2.03- applied to principal, which left</p> <p>10 24.7- and change still outstanding.</p> <p>11 Q. Well, I'm going to ask you about the</p> <p>12 promissory note then, Exhibit 13, in particular</p> <p>13 Section 3, where it says prepayment allowed.</p> <p>14 And the first sentence says, may or -- pardon</p> <p>15 me, maker may prepay in whole or in part the unpaid</p> <p>16 principal or accrued interest of this note.</p> <p>17 Do you see that, sir?</p> <p>18 A. Yes, I see that.</p> <p>19 Q. In your experience, can someone prepay</p> <p>20 accrued interest?</p> <p>21 MR. MORRIS: Objection to the form of the</p> <p>22 question.</p> <p>23 THE WITNESS: The document reads, maker may</p> <p>24 prepay in whole or in part the unpaid principal or</p> <p>25 accrued interest of this note. So I read that to say</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">48</p> <p>1 that's a little bit of a mental jumble.</p> <p>2 Q. Exactly.</p> <p>3 A. Well, what I'm...</p> <p>4 Q. To me one pays accrued interest. But this</p> <p>5 note says you can prepay accrued interest. So I'm just</p> <p>6 seeing whether you as a CPA, CFO and controller for</p> <p>7 years agrees that one can prepay accrued interest?</p> <p>8 MR. MORRIS: Objection to the form of the</p> <p>9 question.</p> <p>10 THE WITNESS: Frankly, I don't know if it's</p> <p>11 possible. That's not how I'm seeing it applied here,</p> <p>12 based on the quick review of Exhibit 14.</p> <p>13 Q. (BY MR. RUKAVINA) Well, the next sentence</p> <p>14 says, any payments on this note shall be applied first</p> <p>15 to unpaid accrued interest hereon, and then to unpaid</p> <p>16 principal hereof.</p> <p>17 Do you see that, sir?</p> <p>18 A. I see that.</p> <p>19 Q. Do you have any understanding based either on</p> <p>20 your personal knowledge or in your expertise as a CPA</p> <p>21 and a CFO as to what that sentence means?</p> <p>22 MR. MORRIS: Objection to the form of the</p> <p>23 question.</p> <p>24 THE WITNESS: The way that I would read that</p> <p>25 would be that for a payment, for example, pick a date,</p>

David Klos - October 27, 2021

<p style="text-align: right;">49</p> <p>1 Exhibit 14 again, the \$2.1 million payment on or about 2 June 19. I see that a payment was made. 3 And it was -- it appears that there was 4 accrued and unpaid interest at that time of 66,000. And 5 so the first 66,000 was applied to outstanding accrued 6 interest, to bring the balance to zero. 7 And the difference between that 66,000 and the 8 2.1 million was applied to principal. 9 Q. (BY MR. RUKAVINA) Do you believe, whether 10 from personal knowledge from this note, Exhibit 13, or 11 your experience at Highland or as a CPA, that one can 12 say that interest, accrued interest will be due on a 13 future date, it will accrue by that date, but I'm going 14 to pay it earlier as of that date? 15 MR. MORRIS: Objection to the form of the 16 question. 17 THE WITNESS: If I can rephrase back to you 18 just so I make sure I'm understanding the question. 19 You're saying could someone say, I would like to prepay 20 interest into the future. It hasn't accrued yet, but 21 it will be accrued by end of year. 22 And I would like to be prepaid effectively 23 with respect to that interest, and then have the 24 remainder used to pay down principal. 25 The question is, can someone do that?</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">51</p> <p>1 believe that has been done in a specific circumstance. 2 Q. So at least at Highland, you would believe 3 that that phrase, prepaying accrued interest, had some 4 established meaning at Highland? 5 MR. MORRIS: Objection to the form of the 6 question. 7 THE WITNESS: No, I don't agree with that. 8 Q. (BY MR. RUKAVINA) Okay. You understand, of 9 course, that it's Highland's position that with respect 10 to this note, a payment was due on December 31 of 2020 11 that wasn't made; correct? 12 A. Yes, it's my understanding -- if I can state 13 it back just so I make sure I'm getting it correctly. 14 It's my understanding that there was a payment due on 15 December 31, 2020, that wasn't made timely, yes. 16 Q. Okay. Do you know why that payment wasn't 17 made timely? 18 A. By recollection, because Mr. Dondero had 19 directed people not to process payments from Highland 20 affiliates to Highland. 21 Q. When did you learn of that? 22 A. Early December 2020. 23 Q. How did you learn of that? 24 A. I don't specifically remember the 25 conversation, but I know I had conversations with both</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">50</p> <p>1 Q. (BY MR. RUKAVINA) Yes. 2 MR. MORRIS: I object to the question. 3 THE WITNESS: I suppose it's possible, but 4 that certainly wasn't the practice if that makes sense. 5 Q. (BY MR. RUKAVINA) That does make sense. I'm 6 still struggling, and again, I'm not trying to be a 7 smart aleck. I'm still struggling with the first 8 sentence of paragraph 3, that maker may prepay accrued 9 interest. 10 And it sounds like to me like you don't 11 necessarily have a definitive answer as to what that 12 might have meant either. 13 MR. MORRIS: Objection to the form of the 14 question. 15 THE WITNESS: I think the document speaks for 16 itself in that sentence. 17 Q. (BY MR. RUKAVINA) But have you seen 18 something like this, to your recollection, in other 19 Highland promissory notes? 20 A. Something like what? 21 Q. Prepaying accrued interest. 22 A. Yes, I have seen that. 23 Q. What's your memory? Where have you seen 24 that? 25 A. I can't remember a specific note, but I</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">52</p> <p>1 Kristin and Frank. I can't remember if those were 2 individual or collective, but we understood that to be 3 the marching orders. 4 Q. Did you hear Mr. Dondero say anything like 5 that? 6 A. I did not. 7 Q. Did Mr. Waterhouse tell you that Mr. Dondero 8 said something like that to him? 9 A. Yes. 10 Q. Okay. Separately, do you remember whether 11 Ms. Hendrix told you that Mr. Waterhouse told her that, 12 or would it have been kind of at the same meeting? 13 A. I don't remember specifically. It would have 14 been all around the same time. 15 Q. And to the best of your recollection, what 16 words -- strike that. 17 To the best of your recollection, did 18 Mr. Waterhouse include a reference to promissory notes 19 and the Advisors when he said that Dondero told him not 20 to make payments? 21 MR. MORRIS: Objection to the form of the 22 question. 23 THE WITNESS: I don't remember the specific 24 words that Mr. Waterhouse used. My clear impression 25 was that it was a very global instruction.</p>

David Klos - October 27, 2021

<p style="text-align: right;">53</p> <p>1 And I should clarify also that, you know, at 2 this time, I think as we covered in my background. 3 At this point I had assumed the chief 4 accounting officer role, so I wasn't necessarily in 5 the -- in as much of the chain of command as I had been 6 previously to taking that role, where that sort of thing 7 might have come from Frank, to me, to Kristin. 8 By this time, Frank and Kristin were 9 communicating and I was sometimes in the loop, sometimes 10 not. 11 Q. (BY MR. RUKAVINA) Did Mr. Waterhouse tell 12 you why Dondero had told him that? 13 A. I don't remember with any specificity. 14 However, my perception at the time was that at this 15 time the relationship between Mr. Dondero and Mr. Seery 16 was hopelessly broken, and that this was Jim Dondero, 17 you know, gearing up for a fight in the future. 18 Q. Prior to December of 2020, had you prepared a 19 report showing potential overpayments that NexPoint and 20 HCMFA had made on account of shared services and 21 payroll reimbursement? 22 MR. MORRIS: Objection to the form of the 23 question. 24 You can answer. 25 THE WITNESS: I know the analysis that you're</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">55</p> <p>1 analysis, right or wrong, suggested that the Advisors 2 had made large overpayments? 3 MR. MORRIS: Objection to the form of the 4 question. 5 THE WITNESS: No, that's incorrect. 6 Q. (BY MR. RUKAVINA) Why is that incorrect? 7 A. Because by recollection, to the best of my 8 recollection, that analysis didn't occur until after 9 Dondero had told Frank no more payments. 10 Q. Is that the only reason why you might suspect 11 that what I just said was incorrect? 12 MR. MORRIS: Objection to the form of the 13 question. 14 THE WITNESS: Yeah, I don't know how to 15 answer that. 16 Q. (BY MR. RUKAVINA) I'm going back, when I 17 asked you, did Waterhouse tell you why Dondero gave the 18 direction, you said no. 19 MR. MORRIS: Objection to the form of the 20 question. 21 THE WITNESS: Sorry, I'm not sure. If I 22 could have the question asked again, I'd be happy to 23 answer. 24 Q. (BY MR. RUKAVINA) I'll ask it again. 25 Mr. Waterhouse tells you that Mr. Dondero</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">54</p> <p>1 talking about. I would not characterize it the way 2 that you characterized it. 3 Q. (BY MR. RUKAVINA) And we'll talk about this 4 more in November, so I really don't want to go into any 5 detail, unless you feel the need to. 6 But, so you did not prepare that analysis? 7 MR. MORRIS: Objection to the form of the 8 question. 9 THE WITNESS: I prepared an analysis that 10 differed from how you described it. 11 Q. (BY MR. RUKAVINA) How would you describe it, 12 in a nutshell? 13 A. I would describe it as I was asked to refresh 14 a spreadsheet using certain assumptions, based on the 15 direction of Frank Waterhouse, and I updated and I sent 16 him an email. 17 Q. Do you have any understanding that that 18 analysis was then shared with Mr. Dondero by 19 Mr. Waterhouse? 20 A. I know that now. I didn't know that at the 21 time. 22 Q. Do you have any understanding -- strike that. 23 Did you have any understanding that as of 24 early December 2020 the reason why Mr. Dondero said 25 what he said to Mr. Waterhouse was because that</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">56</p> <p>1 basically said no more payments; right? 2 A. Yes. 3 Q. And, but he did not tell you why Mr. Dondero 4 said that? 5 A. Not that I can recall. 6 Q. So he might have? 7 A. He might have. I don't specifically 8 remember. 9 Q. Do you recall asking him or anyone else why 10 Dondero would have said that? 11 MR. MORRIS: Objection. Asked and answered. 12 THE WITNESS: I don't recall specifically 13 asking. 14 Q. (BY MR. RUKAVINA) Do you recall telling 15 Mr. Seery that Dondero said anything like that? 16 A. At what point in time? 17 Q. Prior to December 31, 2020. 18 A. No, I did not. I did not say that to 19 Mr. Seery. 20 Q. In your mind was there any present 21 understanding or concern that NexPoint therefore 22 wouldn't make a scheduled December 31, 2020, payment? 23 A. Was there any concern that they wouldn't? 24 Q. Yeah. 25 A. I would never use the word "concern." At</p>

David Klos - October 27, 2021

<p style="text-align: right;">57</p> <p>1 that point I wasn't even on the team anymore, so I hate</p> <p>2 to say it's other people's problem, but I had my hands</p> <p>3 full with plenty of other things. It wasn't something</p> <p>4 I was thinking about.</p> <p>5 Q. Do you remember here today that prior to</p> <p>6 December 31, 2020, you believed that NexPoint would not</p> <p>7 make the scheduled payment?</p> <p>8 MR. MORRIS: Objection to the form of the</p> <p>9 question.</p> <p>10 THE WITNESS: I had no idea whether NexPoint</p> <p>11 was going to make the payment.</p> <p>12 Q. (BY MR. RUKAVINA) Were you asked prior to</p> <p>13 December 31, 2020 by Mr. Seery or anyone else as to</p> <p>14 whether NexPoint was going to make that payment?</p> <p>15 A. Was I asked by Mr. Seery? Not that I can</p> <p>16 remember.</p> <p>17 Q. Prior to December 31, 2020, do you recall any</p> <p>18 discussion with Mr. Seery about the NexPoint note?</p> <p>19 MR. MORRIS: I'm sorry, can I have the</p> <p>20 question again.</p> <p>21 Q. (BY MR. RUKAVINA) Prior to December 31,</p> <p>22 2020, do you recall any discussion that you had with</p> <p>23 Mr. Seery about this NexPoint note?</p> <p>24 A. Not that I can remember. If there was, it</p> <p>25 would have been in a cash meeting, but I don't remember</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">59</p> <p>1 and change payment?</p> <p>2 A. Yeah, I'm aware that that payment happened.</p> <p>3 Q. When did you become aware of that payment?</p> <p>4 A. I think after it happened.</p> <p>5 Q. Can you tell us, was it days, weeks, months</p> <p>6 later?</p> <p>7 A. It was that day. And if I can expand, I</p> <p>8 recall getting an email, seeing a large inflow to</p> <p>9 Highland, to MLP because I was on an email distribution</p> <p>10 list that had those payments.</p> <p>11 And I think I emailed or called Kristin and</p> <p>12 asked her, is this the NexPoint note, because it was a</p> <p>13 large amount of money. And she said yes.</p> <p>14 Q. Did she tell you anything more about that</p> <p>15 payment, when it had been made, why, who authorized it?</p> <p>16 A. I had that information of when it had been</p> <p>17 sent. I had a wire confirm.</p> <p>18 Q. Only important thing to you is where did that</p> <p>19 money come from?</p> <p>20 A. It wasn't important to me. It was more</p> <p>21 curiosity.</p> <p>22 Q. Did you have any discussions with anyone on</p> <p>23 or about that time, January 14, 2021, as to why</p> <p>24 NexPoint made that payment?</p> <p>25 A. Not that I can remember.</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">58</p> <p>1 at all.</p> <p>2 Q. So it might have been some detail as part of</p> <p>3 a larger discussion, but you don't remember any</p> <p>4 specific discussion just around this note?</p> <p>5 A. No.</p> <p>6 Q. When did you learn or how did you learn that</p> <p>7 the December 31 payment had not been made?</p> <p>8 A. I'm not sure, but certainly after</p> <p>9 December 31.</p> <p>10 Q. Do you recall if it was before or after</p> <p>11 January 7?</p> <p>12 A. I think it was after.</p> <p>13 Q. The default letter from Highland is in here,</p> <p>14 if you need to see it. I'm just telling you it's the</p> <p>15 January 7.</p> <p>16 Do you recall having any role with respect to</p> <p>17 drafting the default letter that went out to NexPoint</p> <p>18 after the failed payment?</p> <p>19 A. No, none that I can remember.</p> <p>20 Q. How do you recall learning that the note had</p> <p>21 been called by Highland?</p> <p>22 A. I honestly don't remember. I think after the</p> <p>23 fact. I couldn't tell you how far after the fact.</p> <p>24 Q. Are you aware that on or about July -- I'm</p> <p>25 sorry, January 14, 2021 NexPoint made a \$1.4 million</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">60</p> <p>1 Q. Did you have any discussion with anybody on</p> <p>2 or about that time, January 14, 2021, as to how HCMLP</p> <p>3 should account for that payment?</p> <p>4 A. No.</p> <p>5 Q. Did you have any discussion with Mr. Seery at</p> <p>6 all about whether that payment should or shouldn't</p> <p>7 reinstate the note?</p> <p>8 A. No discussion that I can remember.</p> <p>9 Q. Is it fair to say that any of those</p> <p>10 considerations would have been at that point in time</p> <p>11 above your paygrade?</p> <p>12 MR. MORRIS: Objection to the form of the</p> <p>13 question.</p> <p>14 THE WITNESS: Yeah, paygrade, I don't know</p> <p>15 how to respond to that. Like I said before, I wasn't</p> <p>16 on the team at that point. I wouldn't have been</p> <p>17 involved in that determination regardless of my</p> <p>18 compensation.</p> <p>19 Q. (BY MR. RUKAVINA) So you know and you</p> <p>20 remember that in early December 2020 Frank Waterhouse</p> <p>21 told you that Dondero had directed no more payments by</p> <p>22 the Advisors. And you know that a payment was made on</p> <p>23 January 14.</p> <p>24 And that's pretty much the extent of your</p> <p>25 knowledge about the missed December 31 payment?</p>

David Klos - October 27, 2021

<p style="text-align: right;">61</p> <p>1 MR. MORRIS: Objection to the form of the 2 question. 3 THE WITNESS: Yeah, it's a very broad 4 question. In general terms, yes. 5 Q. (BY MR. RUKAVINA) Well, I'm not asking what 6 you learned since then. 7 I'm asking that as of, let's say, January 15, 8 2021 that would have been the extent of what you would 9 have known? 10 A. Correct. And if I can just restate and make 11 sure I understand what I'm saying. 12 It would have been my understanding that we 13 had had an instruction -- when I say "we," Kristin and 14 Frank and by default the whole corporate team -- not to 15 make payments from these affiliated entities. 16 To my knowledge, none of those payments had 17 occurred since that point. And then on or about 18 January 14, such a payment was made and I found out 19 about that by seeing a wire confirm. 20 Q. Well, you mentioned a couple times that you, 21 in December 2020, you weren't part of that group 22 anymore. So do you have any understanding as to why 23 Mr. Waterhouse would have told you in particular, you 24 being Mr. Klos, about that instruction from Dondero? 25 A. Sure. I still was participating in cash</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">63</p> <p>1 Q. Do you remember any discussion at that 2 approximate point in time for your cash meetings or 3 anything else as to whether NexPoint had made any 4 prepayments on the promissory note? 5 MR. MORRIS: Objection to the form of the 6 question. 7 THE WITNESS: Yeah, it's very hard to -- by 8 the way, I've said yeah a few times. I want to make 9 clear that that's just -- 10 Q. (BY MR. RUKAVINA) That's not a yes? 11 A. I apologize for that. 12 Q. Understood. Yeah means, it's not a yes. 13 MR. MORRIS: It's a pause; it's an um. 14 Q. (BY MR. RUKAVINA) Germans call it flavoring 15 particle. 16 A. Sorry, I got lost there. If you can ask 17 again. 18 Q. Yeah. Do you recall in November or 19 December 2020 in your weekly meetings or anything else, 20 any discussion whatsoever concerning whether NexPoint 21 had made any prepayments on its note? 22 A. No discussions of whether or not there had 23 been a prepayment that I can remember, no. 24 Q. To the best of your knowledge sitting here 25 today -- strike that.</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">62</p> <p>1 meetings, even if it was almost in a nominal role, 2 because of some of my history that I had. So I was 3 still participating in those meetings. 4 I've worked closely with Kristin for a long 5 time, so I may have caught up with her informally. But 6 as far as day-to-day duties, I wasn't part of that team 7 anymore. 8 Q. And is it your, did I understand you 9 correctly, is it your testimony that Mr. Waterhouse 10 informed the whole accounting group there, the 11 corporate accounting group, of Mr. Dondero's 12 instruction? 13 A. I don't know specifically who he told, if he 14 told every single member of the team, but he certainly 15 told Kristin and Kristin was the head of the team. 16 Q. And you don't recall anyone, after you heard 17 about that instruction, raising any concern to the 18 effect that NexPoint is going to default and be in 19 trouble if that payment isn't made? 20 A. I don't remember any discussion to that 21 effect. 22 Q. Do you remember anyone suggesting that they 23 ought to try to dissuade Mr. Dondero from that 24 direction? 25 A. Not that I can remember.</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">64</p> <p>1 For my next question, again we're assuming 2 that Exhibit 14 is what it appears to be. 3 A. Sure, sure. 4 Q. So with that qualification, to the best of 5 your knowledge, other than what's on Exhibit 14, can 6 you think of any other record or source or document 7 that would address whether any unscheduled payments by 8 NexPoint would or wouldn't be prepayments on the note? 9 MR. MORRIS: Objection to the form of the 10 question. 11 THE WITNESS: Again, with the struggle of the 12 prepayment, this is the document that I would expect to 13 explain how the payment was applied. 14 Q. (BY MR. RUKAVINA) But you yourself did not 15 play any role in deciding how the payment would be 16 applied? 17 A. I'd hesitate to say no role, because the team 18 ultimately rolls up to me. 19 Q. You personally? 20 A. Me personally, I wouldn't have prepared these 21 schedules. 22 Q. Or decided, you personally, as Mr. Klos, how 23 any unscheduled payments should be accounted for by 24 Highland? 25 A. Correct, not without some -- some</p>

David Klos - October 27, 2021

<p style="text-align: right;">65</p> <p>1 authoritative direction on how they should be applied.</p> <p>2 Q. And that authoritative direction would have</p> <p>3 come from Mr. Waterhouse or Mr. Dondero?</p> <p>4 A. That's what I would expect.</p> <p>5 Q. Could it have come from anyone else that you</p> <p>6 can think of here today?</p> <p>7 A. Not that I can think of.</p> <p>8 Q. Now we're going to switch gears and I think</p> <p>9 we're going to stop discussing the NexPoint note, and</p> <p>10 we're going to focus on the HCMFA two promissory notes.</p> <p>11 A. Sure.</p> <p>12 Q. So we're going to go back in time to</p> <p>13 May 2019; okay?</p> <p>14 A. Sure.</p> <p>15 Q. And is it fair to say by -- that by May 2019</p> <p>16 there were at least dozens if not hundreds of instances</p> <p>17 of intercompany loans in the years leading up there</p> <p>18 from Highland to one of the other entities?</p> <p>19 MR. MORRIS: Objection to the form of the</p> <p>20 question.</p> <p>21 THE WITNESS: From Highland to one of the</p> <p>22 other entities. Can you help with other entities.</p> <p>23 Q. (BY MR. RUKAVINA) Advisors, the trusts, any</p> <p>24 of the Dondero entities?</p> <p>25 MR. MORRIS: Objection to the form of the</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">67</p> <p>1 Q. (BY MR. RUKAVINA) Are you familiar with</p> <p>2 Exhibits 1 and 2, sir?</p> <p>3 A. Yes, I am.</p> <p>4 Q. Do you remember them from back -- strike</p> <p>5 that.</p> <p>6 Did you have any role, to your knowledge,</p> <p>7 with the preparation of Exhibits 1 and/or 2?</p> <p>8 A. With the preparation of the documents?</p> <p>9 Q. Yeah.</p> <p>10 A. No.</p> <p>11 Q. But you did have some role with these</p> <p>12 promissory notes?</p> <p>13 A. Yes.</p> <p>14 Q. And I'm trying to find that email as well.</p> <p>15 There's an email here from you. I'll have it in a</p> <p>16 moment. That will help frame the question.</p> <p>17 MR. MORRIS: Exhibit 3.</p> <p>18 Q. (BY MR. RUKAVINA) Do you recall that email,</p> <p>19 sir?</p> <p>20 A. Not specifically, but it's right in front of</p> <p>21 me. I'm certain that I wrote this email.</p> <p>22 Q. You have no reason to deny or reject its</p> <p>23 authenticity?</p> <p>24 A. I have no reason to reject it or question it.</p> <p>25 Q. Just give me a second. I don't understand</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">66</p> <p>1 question.</p> <p>2 THE WITNESS: Yes, there would have been many</p> <p>3 loans over the years.</p> <p>4 Q. (BY MR. RUKAVINA) And do I understand that</p> <p>5 most, if not all, of those loans should have been</p> <p>6 papered up with a written promissory note?</p> <p>7 MR. MORRIS: Objection to the form of the</p> <p>8 question.</p> <p>9 THE WITNESS: Should have been. To the</p> <p>10 extent that they were for a promissory note, then yes.</p> <p>11 Q. (BY MR. RUKAVINA) So in the May 2019 time</p> <p>12 frame, was there a regular pattern or course or</p> <p>13 procedure in place as to how a promissory note would be</p> <p>14 physically prepared and presented for approval?</p> <p>15 MR. MORRIS: Objection to the form of the</p> <p>16 question.</p> <p>17 THE WITNESS: Yeah, when you say a process,</p> <p>18 can you please clarify that for me.</p> <p>19 Q. (BY MR. RUKAVINA) Sure. Let's look at these</p> <p>20 two promissory notes and maybe that will help frame the</p> <p>21 question. And I apologize for not having them right</p> <p>22 here.</p> <p>23 A. It might be --</p> <p>24 MR. MORRIS: 1 and 2.</p> <p>25 MR. RUKAVINA: Yes.</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">68</p> <p>1 what's going on with my exhibits. I just don't</p> <p>2 understand this.</p> <p>3 (Off the record.)</p> <p>4 Q. (BY MR. RUKAVINA) You have Exhibit 3 in</p> <p>5 front of you?</p> <p>6 A. I do.</p> <p>7 Q. And it says, please send 2.4 million from</p> <p>8 HCMLP to HCMFA. This is a new interco.</p> <p>9 Meaning intercompany; right?</p> <p>10 A. Correct.</p> <p>11 Q. This is a new intercompany loan.</p> <p>12 Who told you that this was an intercompany</p> <p>13 loan?</p> <p>14 A. Either Frank or Jim. I would suspect Frank.</p> <p>15 Q. Do you have any present memory of him telling</p> <p>16 you that with respect to this particular loan?</p> <p>17 A. I don't have a specific recollection, but</p> <p>18 with a hundred percent certainty he or Jim would have</p> <p>19 directed that.</p> <p>20 Q. Would they have directed the payment, or</p> <p>21 would they have directed that it be papered as a loan,</p> <p>22 or both?</p> <p>23 A. Both.</p> <p>24 Q. So in each instance -- well, let's take a</p> <p>25 step back.</p>

David Klos - October 27, 2021

<p style="text-align: right;">69</p> <p>1 So certainly either Jim or Frank directed you</p> <p>2 to transfer the \$2.4 million; correct?</p> <p>3 A. Either Jim or Frank would have directed, yes.</p> <p>4 There's 0 percent chance I would have sent this email</p> <p>5 if I didn't feel a hundred percent confident that this</p> <p>6 was authorized in the way that I described in the</p> <p>7 email.</p> <p>8 Q. But can you also say with certainty that</p> <p>9 either Dondero or Waterhouse also told you that this</p> <p>10 transfer is an intercompany loan?</p> <p>11 A. With a hundred percent certainty, yes. I</p> <p>12 can't say that necessarily with respect to Dondero,</p> <p>13 because I don't remember if I would have talked to him</p> <p>14 specifically about it. But, yes, this would have been</p> <p>15 clear that it's a loan.</p> <p>16 Q. You say clear. Did someone tell you that</p> <p>17 it's a loan, or are you just, because of the prior</p> <p>18 10 years of course and conduct, logically deciding that</p> <p>19 it has to be a loan?</p> <p>20 MR. MORRIS: Objection to the form of the</p> <p>21 question.</p> <p>22 THE WITNESS: So this is -- this is not just</p> <p>23 a situation of past practice. I would have known with</p> <p>24 certainty that this was a loan and that's what was</p> <p>25 authorized.</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">71</p> <p>1 within that fund.</p> <p>2 Q. Who made that NAV error?</p> <p>3 MR. MORRIS: Objection to the form of the</p> <p>4 question.</p> <p>5 THE WITNESS: Yeah, it's hard to answer that.</p> <p>6 So the Highland Capital Management Fund Advisors is the</p> <p>7 advisor to the fund, so they're the responsible party</p> <p>8 for making the fund whole in the instances of NAV</p> <p>9 errors.</p> <p>10 Q. (BY MR. RUKAVINA) And did HCMFA contract out</p> <p>11 with Highland for valuation services?</p> <p>12 MR. MORRIS: Objection to the form of the</p> <p>13 question.</p> <p>14 THE WITNESS: I don't specifically remember</p> <p>15 if they contracted for valuation services, but if you</p> <p>16 tell me that they did, I'll take that at face value.</p> <p>17 So yes, HCMFA utilized HCMLP for valuation services.</p> <p>18 Q. (BY MR. RUKAVINA) Do you have any memory of</p> <p>19 what human being or beings made that NAV error?</p> <p>20 MR. MORRIS: Objection to the form of the</p> <p>21 question.</p> <p>22 THE WITNESS: It's -- in respect to people,</p> <p>23 not particularly. In respect to parties, Houlihan</p> <p>24 Lokey was the service provider that performed the</p> <p>25 valuation that resulted in the NAV error.</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">70</p> <p>1 Q. (BY MR. RUKAVINA) How would you have known</p> <p>2 with certainty that it was a loan?</p> <p>3 A. I'll say in part because of past practice,</p> <p>4 but also because of the nature of what the money was</p> <p>5 going to be used for, and the background behind it.</p> <p>6 Q. So you knew that nature and that background?</p> <p>7 A. The nature and background of the 2.4 million,</p> <p>8 yes.</p> <p>9 Q. So you've told me that in part -- I asked you</p> <p>10 how did you know it was a loan. You said in part past</p> <p>11 practices, in part you knew the nature. Anything else?</p> <p>12 A. I'm certain that given that I wrote this</p> <p>13 email, which Frank is on, that I would have had a</p> <p>14 conversation with Frank about what this was.</p> <p>15 Q. Was Jim Dondero in the corporate accounting</p> <p>16 email?</p> <p>17 A. No, he wasn't.</p> <p>18 Q. So what is your understanding as to what this</p> <p>19 \$2.4 million was for?</p> <p>20 A. This related to -- well, to separate the</p> <p>21 transaction, the 2.4- itself relates to a promissory</p> <p>22 note. That's what was executed.</p> <p>23 HCMFA's use of the 2.4 million was to</p> <p>24 reimburse a fund that it managed called Highland Global</p> <p>25 Allocation Fund for a NAV error that had occurred</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">72</p> <p>1 And as I described before, the valuation</p> <p>2 function was housed at HCMLP by HCMLP employees</p> <p>3 supporting that through, among other people, front</p> <p>4 office, compliance, other parts of the organization as</p> <p>5 well.</p> <p>6 Q. (BY MR. RUKAVINA) So it was your</p> <p>7 understanding that Highland was loaning \$2.4 million to</p> <p>8 HCMFA for HCMFA to compensate that fund?</p> <p>9 A. Yes.</p> <p>10 Q. Did you have any understanding that Highland</p> <p>11 might have been, instead of loaning that money,</p> <p>12 actually paying that money to HCMFA to compensate HCMFA</p> <p>13 for Highland's valuation error?</p> <p>14 A. First, not Highland's valuation error. But</p> <p>15 second, no, there's no way that that would have been</p> <p>16 what that payment was for.</p> <p>17 Q. Why can you say that there's no way that that</p> <p>18 would have been what that payment was for?</p> <p>19 A. First, this wasn't the first NAV error that</p> <p>20 ever occurred. There had been other NAV errors. There</p> <p>21 were other NAV errors with respect to this valuation</p> <p>22 that pertain to NexPoint Advisors.</p> <p>23 There was no reimbursement from HCMLP to</p> <p>24 NexPoint or HCMFA, regardless of any individual being</p> <p>25 identified as the person. That had just never occurred</p>

David Klos - October 27, 2021

<p style="text-align: right;">73</p> <p>1 to my knowledge.</p> <p>2 Second, the amount was to meet the liquidity</p> <p>3 need of HCMFA. It wasn't to -- it wasn't to</p> <p>4 dollar-for-dollar make up for the NAV error. It was</p> <p>5 that's how much money HCMFA needed.</p> <p>6 Third, it was definitely Dondero's practice</p> <p>7 and preference to have expenses at HCMFA for tax</p> <p>8 purposes. So if this was compensation, he would</p> <p>9 ultimately not really be benefiting from the deduction</p> <p>10 so.</p> <p>11 That would have been a strong preference of</p> <p>12 his against having it be compensation.</p> <p>13 So it would have been excruciatingly clear</p> <p>14 that this was a loan for liquidity for HCMFA to make</p> <p>15 the fund whole, just like it had in the past NAV</p> <p>16 errors.</p> <p>17 Q. How did you know that HCMFA needed</p> <p>18 \$2.4 million for liquidity?</p> <p>19 A. At that point I was still part of the</p> <p>20 corporate team, so I had a good sense of how much cash</p> <p>21 HCMFA would have had at any given moment. And at that</p> <p>22 given moment it would not have had -- I'd be shocked if</p> <p>23 it had even 2.4-.</p> <p>24 Probably would have had probably between</p> <p>25 a million and 2 million if I had to speculate.</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">75</p> <p>1 HCMFA for the liquidity. HCMFA made the payment to the</p> <p>2 fund. It wasn't dollar for dollar. I think it was</p> <p>3 like 5,019,000, or some such number.</p> <p>4 But 5 million was the number that would allow</p> <p>5 it to make that payment effectively to the investors of</p> <p>6 Global Allocation Fund.</p> <p>7 Q. Do you have any understanding as to why</p> <p>8 Highland, as opposed to some other entity, was</p> <p>9 transferring \$7.4 million?</p> <p>10 A. Highland as opposed to some other entity?</p> <p>11 Q. Uh-huh.</p> <p>12 A. Because Highland had the money.</p> <p>13 Q. But I think we've established earlier that in</p> <p>14 the first seven months of 2019, Highland was having</p> <p>15 constant liquidity issues?</p> <p>16 A. It was.</p> <p>17 Q. And that's part of the reason that NexPoint</p> <p>18 was making unscheduled payments on its note; right?</p> <p>19 A. That's part of the reason NexPoint was making</p> <p>20 unscheduled payments on its note, yes.</p> <p>21 Q. So your recollection is that HCMFA needed</p> <p>22 \$2.4 million for liquidity purposes and about</p> <p>23 \$5 million for the consent fee. And Highland</p> <p>24 transferred those funds because Highland had the funds?</p> <p>25 A. Yes. And I should clarify that Highland only</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">74</p> <p>1 Q. Okay. So you've given the reasons why this</p> <p>2 was clearly a loan.</p> <p>3 But you never heard Mr. Dondero say that this</p> <p>4 was a loan, did you?</p> <p>5 A. I don't remember. It's possible I did, but I</p> <p>6 don't specifically remember.</p> <p>7 Q. Okay. What about the \$5 million loan on the</p> <p>8 day after? What was that \$5 million for?</p> <p>9 A. That was similar but different. So again,</p> <p>10 HCMFA needed liquidity. This time this was for --</p> <p>11 related to that same fund.</p> <p>12 So Highland Global Allocation Fund had</p> <p>13 converted from an open-end fund, mutual fund, to a</p> <p>14 closed-end mutual fund.</p> <p>15 And pursuant to that conversion there was a,</p> <p>16 I believe it was called a consent fee, for any</p> <p>17 investors of that fund who consented to the conversion,</p> <p>18 that they would receive a 3 percent fee payable by the</p> <p>19 investment advisor.</p> <p>20 And so at this time the bill came due on that</p> <p>21 because the conversion had been completed, and the</p> <p>22 accounting for how much that 3 percent was going to be</p> <p>23 was complete.</p> <p>24 HCMFA sure as hell didn't have 5 million</p> <p>25 bucks. Excuse my language. Highland needed to pay</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">76</p> <p>1 had the funds because Mr. Dondero repaid personal notes</p> <p>2 to HCMLP on the same days.</p> <p>3 So he paid 2.4 million on May 2, which</p> <p>4 Highland turned around and reloaned. And he paid 4.4-</p> <p>5 on May 3, and Highland sent out 5-, so there's a</p> <p>6 \$600,000 difference. And my recollection, he paid the</p> <p>7 other 600,000 via note repayment within a few days.</p> <p>8 Q. So this would have been part of some broader</p> <p>9 transaction in Mr. Dondero's mind?</p> <p>10 A. I would not characterize it that way.</p> <p>11 Q. You established that HCMFA needed money. You</p> <p>12 established that Highland temporarily had money because</p> <p>13 Dondero provided it with money.</p> <p>14 But you still don't know, sir, as a fact as</p> <p>15 to whether that transfer was a loan or some other</p> <p>16 payment from HCMFA -- I'm sorry from HCM, from debtor</p> <p>17 to HCMFA?</p> <p>18 MR. MORRIS: Objection to the form of the</p> <p>19 question. Asked and answered a million times. It's in</p> <p>20 the documents you're showing him.</p> <p>21 THE WITNESS: It was a loan.</p> <p>22 MR. MORRIS: Come on, Davor. With all due</p> <p>23 respect, it's in the document. It's on the document.</p> <p>24 Q. (BY MR. RUKAVINA) I'm being courteous and</p> <p>25 respectful to you and I'd ask the same in return; okay?</p>

David Klos - October 27, 2021

<p style="text-align: right;">77</p> <p>1 A. Absolutely. I apologize if I haven't been.</p> <p>2 Q. Mr. Dondero, would you agree, was the only</p> <p>3 person that had the authority at the debtor to</p> <p>4 authorize a transfer of 2.4- and then \$5 million?</p> <p>5 A. At the debtor?</p> <p>6 MR. MORRIS: Objection to the form of the</p> <p>7 question.</p> <p>8 Q. (BY MR. RUKAVINA) Yes, at the debtor.</p> <p>9 A. No.</p> <p>10 Q. Who else could have transferred 2.4 million</p> <p>11 or \$5 million?</p> <p>12 A. Those are two different questions. But if</p> <p>13 you're asking who had the authority, certainly Frank</p> <p>14 did as well.</p> <p>15 Q. So Frank had the authority. Perhaps my</p> <p>16 question was inartful.</p> <p>17 Do you believe that Mr. Waterhouse would have</p> <p>18 decided to transfer \$2.4 million or \$5 million without</p> <p>19 Mr. Dondero's approval?</p> <p>20 MR. MORRIS: Objection to the form of the</p> <p>21 question.</p> <p>22 THE WITNESS: Generally speaking, no, but I</p> <p>23 don't know exactly what the form of the approval. But</p> <p>24 he certainly wouldn't have done that on his own without</p> <p>25 discussing with Dondero.</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">79</p> <p>1 into the note on behalf of HCMFA, yes.</p> <p>2 Q. (BY MR. RUKAVINA) Was that something that he</p> <p>3 would have done without Mr. Dondero's approval to your</p> <p>4 understanding and practice at that time?</p> <p>5 MR. MORRIS: Objection to the form of the</p> <p>6 question.</p> <p>7 THE WITNESS: Same answer that I gave before</p> <p>8 with respect to Highland.</p> <p>9 Q. (BY MR. RUKAVINA) So here's where I'm going</p> <p>10 with all this.</p> <p>11 Mr. Dondero's position, and tomorrow his</p> <p>12 testimony will be, that he caused the \$7.4 million to</p> <p>13 be transferred not as a loan to HCMFA, but to</p> <p>14 compensate HCMFA for various things including that NAV</p> <p>15 error.</p> <p>16 Other than perhaps you think he's lying,</p> <p>17 would you have any knowledge, hearsay, document,</p> <p>18 anything, to contradict Mr. Dondero's position?</p> <p>19 MR. MORRIS: Objection to the form of the</p> <p>20 question.</p> <p>21 THE WITNESS: Yes. I would point to the fact</p> <p>22 that as it pertains to the \$5 million note, if we're</p> <p>23 separating issues, there's no other possibility of what</p> <p>24 that money could be other than either a loan or equity.</p> <p>25 It's not compensation. Highland is under --</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">78</p> <p>1 Q. (BY MR. RUKAVINA) Do you believe that</p> <p>2 Mr. Waterhouse had the ability on behalf of the debtor</p> <p>3 to loan \$5 million without Mr. Dondero's approval?</p> <p>4 MR. MORRIS: Objection to the form of the</p> <p>5 question.</p> <p>6 THE WITNESS: I think he had the technical</p> <p>7 authority to. However, I don't believe in practice</p> <p>8 that he ever would.</p> <p>9 Q. (BY MR. RUKAVINA) Same question, \$2.4</p> <p>10 million?</p> <p>11 A. Same answer.</p> <p>12 Q. We've established that you never really had a</p> <p>13 direct employment or types of a role for NexPoint --</p> <p>14 I'm sorry, for HCMFA; right?</p> <p>15 A. Again --</p> <p>16 Q. To the best of your recollection?</p> <p>17 A. Best of my recollection I can't remember how</p> <p>18 the titles transferred over or whatever, but I don't</p> <p>19 believe I did.</p> <p>20 Q. Do you know whether Mr. Waterhouse in 2019</p> <p>21 had the authority, without Mr. Dondero's approval, to</p> <p>22 borrow \$7.4 million on behalf of HCMFA?</p> <p>23 MR. MORRIS: Objection to the form of the</p> <p>24 question.</p> <p>25 THE WITNESS: He had the authority to enter</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">80</p> <p>1 HCMLP has absolutely zero obligation in respect to that</p> <p>2 consent fee. So when Highland sends \$5 million to HCMFA</p> <p>3 there's nothing else that it can be. That's Point 1.</p> <p>4 Point 2, we're right in the middle of an audit</p> <p>5 at this point. Jim signs rep letters at this point.</p> <p>6 He's being provided balance sheets throughout 2019 that</p> <p>7 indicate the loans that Highland has on its books.</p> <p>8 Balance sheets are being prepared in respect</p> <p>9 of annual approvals for 15(c) for retail funds in the</p> <p>10 fall. Schedules are being created for bankruptcy after</p> <p>11 we file in October.</p> <p>12 Nobody says this is a mistake. Frank is on</p> <p>13 all of these emails. Frank never questions it.</p> <p>14 There's absolutely no evidence from that point</p> <p>15 in time to whenever this defense got raised that would</p> <p>16 indicate that anybody said that these weren't exactly</p> <p>17 what they say they are.</p> <p>18 Q. (BY MR. RUKAVINA) Are you aware that in</p> <p>19 February or March 2019 some \$5.2 million was paid from</p> <p>20 insurance that HCMFA had to the fund for the NAV error?</p> <p>21 A. The amount sounds unfamiliar, but I'm aware</p> <p>22 that insurance proceeds were paid from HCMFA to the</p> <p>23 fund.</p> <p>24 Q. And do you think that it's impossible for a</p> <p>25 sane, rational person to conclude that HCMFA had a</p>

David Klos - October 27, 2021

<p style="text-align: right;">81</p> <p>1 claim against the debtor related to that NAV error?</p> <p>2 MR. MORRIS: Objection to the form of the</p> <p>3 question.</p> <p>4 THE WITNESS: If it did, I don't know how</p> <p>5 that's not insurance fraud for basically double</p> <p>6 collecting insurance proceeds and then collecting it</p> <p>7 again.</p> <p>8 Q. (BY MR. RUKAVINA) So you believe, sir, that</p> <p>9 if insurance pays a claim you have no more right to go</p> <p>10 against a person who caused the fault?</p> <p>11 MR. MORRIS: Objection to the form of the</p> <p>12 question.</p> <p>13 THE WITNESS: We can speak specifically here.</p> <p>14 This is about a NAV error that an insurance company</p> <p>15 reimbursed HCMFA for, which it then turned around and</p> <p>16 paid for the fund.</p> <p>17 So if it went to collect that same, let's use</p> <p>18 round numbers, \$5 million from Highland that it's</p> <p>19 already collected from insurance, that sounds</p> <p>20 inappropriate to me.</p> <p>21 Q. (BY MR. RUKAVINA) Okay. But you don't know</p> <p>22 whether that's allowed in Texas law or not, do you?</p> <p>23 MR. MORRIS: Objection to the form of the</p> <p>24 question.</p> <p>25 THE WITNESS: No, I don't know whether it's</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">83</p> <p>1 A. Yes, I am. I believe Kristin sent that one.</p> <p>2 Q. Kristin sent that one?</p> <p>3 A. I believe so.</p> <p>4 Q. To whom?</p> <p>5 A. Likely the same distribution group, but</p> <p>6 that's speculation.</p> <p>7 Q. Did you see such an email in the last week or</p> <p>8 two?</p> <p>9 A. I'm not certain, but probably. I have seen</p> <p>10 email communication on or around May 3, but I don't</p> <p>11 know specifically who all was on the email. I'm going</p> <p>12 off what I would expect to see.</p> <p>13 MR. MORRIS: If you're really interested,</p> <p>14 it's right here. It was produced to you with</p> <p>15 Bates 3763. And if you'd like to question the witness.</p> <p>16 MR. RUKAVINA: When was it produced?</p> <p>17 MR. MORRIS: I can't tell you. It's part of</p> <p>18 the same package.</p> <p>19 Q. (BY MR. RUKAVINA) So going back to this</p> <p>20 Exhibit 3, sir, why did you ask Kristin, can you or</p> <p>21 Hayley please prep a note for execution? Why them?</p> <p>22 Remember, I was asking about what the course</p> <p>23 or procedure was at that point in time.</p> <p>24 A. Yeah, so nomenclature, procedure, process.</p> <p>25 I would say the informal process for these</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">82</p> <p>1 allowed under Texas law.</p> <p>2 Q. (BY MR. RUKAVINA) So you don't know that if</p> <p>3 you're hit by someone on the street and your medical</p> <p>4 insurance pays your bills, you don't know that he still</p> <p>5 has to pay you for the same bills?</p> <p>6 MR. MORRIS: Objection to the form of the</p> <p>7 question. I hope I don't miss my plane.</p> <p>8 Q. (BY MR. RUKAVINA) You don't know that under</p> <p>9 Texas law if someone hits you with their car and causes</p> <p>10 you medical bills and your medical insurance pays those</p> <p>11 bills, that you can still sue them for the same</p> <p>12 damages?</p> <p>13 MR. MORRIS: Objection to the form of the</p> <p>14 question.</p> <p>15 THE WITNESS: I'm not familiar at any level</p> <p>16 of specificity with Texas law.</p> <p>17 Q. (BY MR. RUKAVINA) Again, it just sounds</p> <p>18 wrong to you that you could go after someone after</p> <p>19 insurance pays, but you don't know legally one way or</p> <p>20 the other?</p> <p>21 A. Correct. I'm not a lawyer or expert in Texas</p> <p>22 law. It feels wrong, yes.</p> <p>23 Q. Okay. Going back to this email of yours,</p> <p>24 Exhibit 3, do you recall whether there was a similar</p> <p>25 email with respect to the \$5 million note?</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">84</p> <p>1 types of loans, they were frequent in nature, would be</p> <p>2 for someone on the corporate accounting team to prepare</p> <p>3 a note and have it executed.</p> <p>4 Q. Okay. That was the standard course back</p> <p>5 then?</p> <p>6 A. Again, I don't know what standard course</p> <p>7 means. That was fairly typical.</p> <p>8 Q. Why would you not have asked someone in the</p> <p>9 Highland legal department to prepare a note?</p> <p>10 A. Because this was a legally reviewed document</p> <p>11 as far as the form of the agreement. It's a one-page,</p> <p>12 two-paragraph form that had been used for a long time.</p> <p>13 So the only thing that would change with</p> <p>14 respect to these notes would be the date, the amount,</p> <p>15 likely the rate. I can't think of anything else</p> <p>16 offhand that would have changed from note to note.</p> <p>17 Q. After you asked Ms. Hendrix to prepare this</p> <p>18 note, did you have any further role with respect to the</p> <p>19 papering, preparation, or execution of that note?</p> <p>20 A. Not that I can remember.</p> <p>21 Q. Would you have had any role in having either</p> <p>22 or both of the notes actually signed electronically or</p> <p>23 by ink by Mr. Waterhouse?</p> <p>24 A. Likely not, no.</p> <p>25 Q. Do you know who decided to have</p>

David Klos - October 27, 2021

<p style="text-align: right;">85</p> <p>1 Mr. Waterhouse as opposed to Mr. Dondero sign these two</p> <p>2 promissory notes?</p> <p>3 A. I don't.</p> <p>4 Q. On the \$5 million note, do you remember if</p> <p>5 you had any role with respect to its physical papering</p> <p>6 or execution?</p> <p>7 A. Not that I recall.</p> <p>8 Q. To the best of your memory, your role would</p> <p>9 have been done by instructing your team, hey, here is</p> <p>10 these new loans, go paper it up; is that accurate?</p> <p>11 A. On the upfront side. I suppose my role would</p> <p>12 have also included on the back end making sure that the</p> <p>13 actual payment had occurred. But that would have been</p> <p>14 doing that realtime, seeing the funds went out, and</p> <p>15 that, most importantly, that the consent fee had been</p> <p>16 paid from HCMFA to the transfer agent.</p> <p>17 Q. How did you or anyone on your team know -- so</p> <p>18 obviously, you know it's a \$2.4 million loan because</p> <p>19 that's what Waterhouse or Dondero told you; right?</p> <p>20 How did you know it was a \$2.4 million loan?</p> <p>21 MR. MORRIS: Objection. Asked and answered.</p> <p>22 THE WITNESS: I knew that the NAV error was</p> <p>23 2 million, I think it was 398,000, somewhere in that</p> <p>24 ballpark. And that 2.4- had been authorized for that</p> <p>25 purpose.</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">87</p> <p>1 Q. Did you have any understanding in early May</p> <p>2 of 2019 as to whether HCMFA was solvent or insolvent?</p> <p>3 MR. MORRIS: Objection to the form of the</p> <p>4 question.</p> <p>5 THE WITNESS: Whether HCMFA was solvent or</p> <p>6 insolvent? I'm not a solvency expert, so I don't know</p> <p>7 that I could even attempt to answer that.</p> <p>8 Q. (BY MR. RUKAVINA) Did you have an</p> <p>9 understanding as far as HCMFA goes on May 2, 2019, that</p> <p>10 its liabilities exceeded its assets?</p> <p>11 A. I don't remember specifically where it stood</p> <p>12 on assets versus liabilities.</p> <p>13 Q. Do you have any memory that by May 2, 2019,</p> <p>14 the debtor had taken a couple prior demand notes from</p> <p>15 HCMFA and made them not collectible prior to May 31,</p> <p>16 2021?</p> <p>17 A. I know what you're referring to. I wouldn't</p> <p>18 characterize it that way.</p> <p>19 Q. How would you characterize it?</p> <p>20 A. I recall that there was a financial support</p> <p>21 acknowledgment, I think it was the name of the</p> <p>22 acknowledgment.</p> <p>23 That described -- I can't remember if it</p> <p>24 described those two notes specifically or just referred</p> <p>25 to them, that there would not be collection sought on</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">86</p> <p>1 Q. (BY MR. RUKAVINA) Do you know who decided</p> <p>2 what the interest rate in this note would be, or that</p> <p>3 it would be a demand note as opposed to a term note?</p> <p>4 A. I don't specifically know who made that</p> <p>5 decision. However, the common practice for fund</p> <p>6 advisors was to put -- was for the rate to equal the, I</p> <p>7 forget if it was the short-term or long-term AFR.</p> <p>8 And for the note to be demand, that was just</p> <p>9 the standard -- that was the standard.</p> <p>10 Q. And I think I asked this, but just if I</p> <p>11 didn't.</p> <p>12 For either or both of these two notes, the</p> <p>13 2.4- and \$5 million note, did you have any role with</p> <p>14 respect to Mr. Waterhouse signing them?</p> <p>15 A. No, not that I can remember. I don't think I</p> <p>16 did.</p> <p>17 Q. And you don't remember doing anything to get</p> <p>18 his signatures?</p> <p>19 A. Not that I recall.</p> <p>20 Q. Nor would that have been something that you</p> <p>21 would expect that you would have a role with?</p> <p>22 A. Certainly not in this instance. Maybe to the</p> <p>23 extent that nobody else was around and it was time</p> <p>24 sensitive, but that wouldn't have been the case with</p> <p>25 these, I don't believe.</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">88</p> <p>1 those until May 31 of 2021.</p> <p>2 Q. Do you remember why that document was done?</p> <p>3 A. My recollection, and it could have been done</p> <p>4 for other reasons, but my recollection of it was that</p> <p>5 it was primarily audit-driven.</p> <p>6 For the auditors to be comfortable that these</p> <p>7 notes weren't going to be just called and FA not have</p> <p>8 the ability to pay them right away.</p> <p>9 Q. Because it's true in April or May of 2019</p> <p>10 HCMFA didn't have the ability to pay those notes;</p> <p>11 correct?</p> <p>12 A. It didn't have enough cash to pay those.</p> <p>13 Q. And I think you mentioned before that in</p> <p>14 May 2019 the auditors at the Highland level were</p> <p>15 talking about rolling up prior demand notes into term</p> <p>16 notes so the debtor would at least get some regular</p> <p>17 cash flow; correct?</p> <p>18 MR. MORRIS: Objection to the form of the</p> <p>19 question.</p> <p>20 THE WITNESS: No.</p> <p>21 Q. (BY MR. RUKAVINA) So you recall that -- I'm</p> <p>22 sorry, that was 2017. I was wrong; right?</p> <p>23 A. Correct.</p> <p>24 Q. So I guess here is my question, and I'm</p> <p>25 struggling to understand this.</p>

David Klos - October 27, 2021

<p style="text-align: right;">89</p> <p>1 So why would Highland be loaning an</p> <p>2 additional \$7.4 million in early May of 2019 to HCMFA</p> <p>3 when HCMFA already was then unable to repay its debts</p> <p>4 to Highland?</p> <p>5 MR. MORRIS: Objection to the form of the</p> <p>6 question.</p> <p>7 THE WITNESS: Yeah, I kind of reject the</p> <p>8 premise of the question, and these are all controlled</p> <p>9 by Jim. And it's completely within his power at any</p> <p>10 point in time to make any payment on any of the loans,</p> <p>11 depending on where priorities sit.</p> <p>12 So the idea that HCMFA -- that Highland would</p> <p>13 be doing a credit analysis on HCMFA, determining that it</p> <p>14 was unable to make that payment and, therefore, this is</p> <p>15 a bad note, is a completely foreign, preposterous</p> <p>16 concept at that time.</p> <p>17 Q. (BY MR. RUKAVINA) And in May of 2019 isn't</p> <p>18 it also, sir, the case that Mr. Dondero could have,</p> <p>19 right or wrong, agree or disagree, said, that 7.4- is</p> <p>20 going to compensate HCMFA for the NAV error as opposed</p> <p>21 to being a loan?</p> <p>22 A. No.</p> <p>23 Q. That's not possible?</p> <p>24 A. No.</p> <p>25 Q. And why is that not possible?</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">91</p> <p>1 Q. (BY MR. RUKAVINA) So it had to have been a</p> <p>2 loan; correct?</p> <p>3 MR. MORRIS: Objection to the form of the</p> <p>4 question.</p> <p>5 THE WITNESS: In these instances I know it to</p> <p>6 have been a loan.</p> <p>7 Q. (BY MR. RUKAVINA) Because of what</p> <p>8 Mr. Waterhouse told you?</p> <p>9 MR. MORRIS: Objection to the form of the</p> <p>10 question. Asked and answered.</p> <p>11 THE WITNESS: Yeah, it was my understanding</p> <p>12 that these were loans.</p> <p>13 Q. (BY MR. RUKAVINA) You know these 7.4- to be</p> <p>14 loans even though you never heard Mr. Dondero say that</p> <p>15 to you?</p> <p>16 A. Yes, although to be fair, I don't know</p> <p>17 whether I ever heard Mr. Dondero. It's possible he did</p> <p>18 say it.</p> <p>19 MR. MORRIS: Objection. Withdrawn.</p> <p>20 Q. (BY MR. RUKAVINA) You have no memory that on</p> <p>21 or before May 4, 2019 you heard Mr. Dondero say that</p> <p>22 the \$2.4 million transfer and/or the \$5 million</p> <p>23 transfer to HCMFA were loans?</p> <p>24 A. I have no specific recollection, but such a</p> <p>25 conversation is just off the reservation impossible.</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">90</p> <p>1 A. As we discussed, the 5-, there's absolutely</p> <p>2 no construct where that can be compensation for an NAV</p> <p>3 error. It's not a NAV error. It's a consent fee.</p> <p>4 Highland has absolutely no responsibility for that.</p> <p>5 Highland also has no responsibility for the</p> <p>6 2.4-, but if you want to assume that it did, that's</p> <p>7 completely not the practice. It was Jim's preference</p> <p>8 to do these via loans, and that's how it was booked.</p> <p>9 Q. You're saying on the one hand Mr. Dondero can</p> <p>10 absolutely control that one entity make a loan to</p> <p>11 another, irrespective of credit worthiness, but he</p> <p>12 can't decide that a transfer is compensation as opposed</p> <p>13 to a loan?</p> <p>14 MR. MORRIS: Objection to the form of the</p> <p>15 question. Argumentative.</p> <p>16 THE WITNESS: If he wants to call</p> <p>17 \$7.4 million compensation to himself or to HCMFA, I</p> <p>18 just don't know how he does that. This is me being an</p> <p>19 accountant. I don't know how that's possible.</p> <p>20 If he wants to pay himself a \$7.4 million</p> <p>21 bonus from HCMFA, fine, he has the power to do that. If</p> <p>22 he wants Highland to inject 7.4 million of equity into</p> <p>23 HCMFA, he has the power to do that.</p> <p>24 But sending the 7.4 million and calling it</p> <p>25 something else, I don't know how he could do that.</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">92</p> <p>1 That there's no way -- there's no way -- there's no way</p> <p>2 that it would have been described that way and there's</p> <p>3 a hundred percent that it's loan.</p> <p>4 Q. Do you have any memory discussing prior --</p> <p>5 MR. MORRIS: Objection. Asked and answered.</p> <p>6 He's answered this a thousand times.</p> <p>7 Q. (BY MR. RUKAVINA) Do you have any memory on</p> <p>8 or before May 2, 2019 discussing the \$2.4 million</p> <p>9 transfer with Mr. Dondero at all?</p> <p>10 A. I do recall, I don't remember the time, but I</p> <p>11 do remember discussing the NAV error in general terms</p> <p>12 and the potential magnitude of that. I don't remember</p> <p>13 specifically when that occurred.</p> <p>14 Q. At least in your discussion with Mr. Dondero,</p> <p>15 the \$2.4 million loan or note was somehow linked to the</p> <p>16 NAV error?</p> <p>17 A. Linked to the NAV error is strong. It</p> <p>18 related to the NAV error from the standpoint that</p> <p>19 that's what Highland was loaning HCMFA the money for,</p> <p>20 because HCMFA couldn't otherwise make the payment</p> <p>21 itself.</p> <p>22 Q. You just said Highland was loaning the money</p> <p>23 for. Are you remembering now Mr. Dondero saying that</p> <p>24 or are you just extrapolating?</p> <p>25 A. No, I'm explaining rationally what the</p>

David Klos - October 27, 2021

<p style="text-align: right;">93</p> <p>1 situation was.</p> <p>2 Q. Do you remember on or before May 3, 2019</p> <p>3 discussing the \$5 million transfer with Mr. Dondero?</p> <p>4 A. Again, in general terms. I couldn't tell you</p> <p>5 a time period, but this was something that, between</p> <p>6 Frank and I, we had put on Jim's radar that this would</p> <p>7 be a cash need in the future. I couldn't specify</p> <p>8 specifically when that happened.</p> <p>9 Q. Okay. You have no present memory of</p> <p>10 discussing that issue with Mr. Dondero on or before</p> <p>11 May 3, 2019? It must have happened but you have no</p> <p>12 memory?</p> <p>13 MR. MORRIS: Objection to the form of the</p> <p>14 question.</p> <p>15 THE WITNESS: We discussed that there would</p> <p>16 be a consent fee payable from HCMFA. We would have</p> <p>17 discussed -- and again, I don't remember where I was,</p> <p>18 what day it was, the specifics around the conversation.</p> <p>19 But I know that we had conversations</p> <p>20 pertaining to cash, because this was a large need for --</p> <p>21 cash need for HCMFA to satisfy this, and this was an</p> <p>22 important payment.</p> <p>23 And neither HCMFA nor Highland had the</p> <p>24 wherewithal to make that payment. The only way that</p> <p>25 those could make the payment was by Jim Dondero repaying</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">95</p> <p>1 Q. So it's possible that Mr. Dondero told no one</p> <p>2 that these were loans but because y'all have been doing</p> <p>3 it this way for 10 years, that everyone, all of you</p> <p>4 CPAs, understood that it had to be a loan?</p> <p>5 MR. MORRIS: Objection to the form of the</p> <p>6 question.</p> <p>7 Q. (BY MR. RUKAVINA) My question is, is that</p> <p>8 possible?</p> <p>9 A. I really don't think it's possible. I</p> <p>10 suppose people say anything is possible. Again, two</p> <p>11 and a half years ago, I'm certain that that was the</p> <p>12 intent at the time and I'm sure it was communicated as</p> <p>13 such. I just don't have a specific recollection.</p> <p>14 MR. RUKAVINA: Thank you.</p> <p>15 I'll pass the witness.</p> <p>16 MR. MORRIS: Michael, do you have any</p> <p>17 questions?</p> <p>18 MR. AIGEN: I do. I assume you want me to</p> <p>19 start now to do my best to be done at 5:00?</p> <p>20 MR. MORRIS: Yes, please.</p> <p>21 EXAMINATION</p> <p>22 Q. (BY MR. AIGEN) Good afternoon, Mr. Klos. My</p> <p>23 name is Michael Aigen with the Stinson law firm. I</p> <p>24 represent Mr. Dondero, HCMS, and HCRE.</p> <p>25 How are you today?</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">94</p> <p>1 loans that he owed to HCMLP. So we absolutely discussed</p> <p>2 that with Jim Dondero.</p> <p>3 Q. (BY MR. RUKAVINA) And with respect to</p> <p>4 everything that we just talked about and your</p> <p>5 recollection, you still don't remember Mr. Dondero</p> <p>6 saying to you or Mr. Waterhouse one way or the other</p> <p>7 that one or both of these transfers were loans?</p> <p>8 MR. MORRIS: Objection to the form of the</p> <p>9 question. Asked and answered.</p> <p>10 THE WITNESS: Yeah, again --</p> <p>11 Q. (BY MR. RUKAVINA) Just yes or no. This is a</p> <p>12 yes-or-no question.</p> <p>13 MR. MORRIS: Let him answer the question.</p> <p>14 MR. RUKAVINA: If he'll answer the question</p> <p>15 I'll stop asking him --</p> <p>16 MR. MORRIS: He's allowed --</p> <p>17 Q. (BY MR. RUKAVINA) The answer [verbatim] is,</p> <p>18 do you remember --</p> <p>19 A. I don't remember Jim's exact words two and a</p> <p>20 half years ago in respect to authorizing these</p> <p>21 payments. So to answer your question, no, I don't</p> <p>22 specifically remember him saying these are loans.</p> <p>23 But every other fact around this tells me</p> <p>24 that we did have that conversation and that was the</p> <p>25 conclusion and that was the direction.</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">96</p> <p>1 A. I'm very good, thank you.</p> <p>2 Q. First topic I wanted to ask you about is the</p> <p>3 defense raised by some of the defendants related to an</p> <p>4 oral agreement and condition subsequent.</p> <p>5 So my question for you generally is, are you</p> <p>6 aware that some of the defendants in these proceedings</p> <p>7 have raised a defense that there was a subsequent oral</p> <p>8 agreement allowing notes to be potentially forgiven if</p> <p>9 certain events occur?</p> <p>10 A. Yeah, I'm generally aware of the defenses</p> <p>11 sitting here today.</p> <p>12 Q. And how are you generally aware of this</p> <p>13 defense?</p> <p>14 A. I don't know with specificity. Potentially</p> <p>15 through just document flow on the bankruptcy side,</p> <p>16 potentially with conversations internally or with</p> <p>17 counsel. But I generally understand them to have been</p> <p>18 raised, the defenses that is.</p> <p>19 Q. And I don't want to get into conversations</p> <p>20 with counsel. I'm not allowed to do that.</p> <p>21 Let me ask you, have you had any</p> <p>22 conversations with anyone other than counsel about this</p> <p>23 subsequent oral agreement defense?</p> <p>24 A. I have had general conversations with</p> <p>25 Mr. Seery about it. And other than that, nothing</p>

David Klos - October 27, 2021

<p style="text-align: right;">97</p> <p>1 substantive.</p> <p>2 Q. And what did you discuss about this with</p> <p>3 Mr. Seery?</p> <p>4 A. I've discussed with him, I hate to phrase it</p> <p>5 this way, the ridiculousness of the defense. Under</p> <p>6 oath. I've discussed my general understanding of what</p> <p>7 is being asserted as a defense.</p> <p>8 Which is that there was some sort of an oral</p> <p>9 agreement between Jim and his sister at some point in</p> <p>10 the past pertaining to forgiveness of certain</p> <p>11 promissory notes that was conditional upon Highland</p> <p>12 monetizing any of three PE assets for any amount above</p> <p>13 cost.</p> <p>14 Q. And is it fair to say that prior to these</p> <p>15 lawsuits being brought, you weren't aware of any oral</p> <p>16 agreements related to the promissory notes related to</p> <p>17 potential forgiveness?</p> <p>18 A. That's correct. Not that I can remember, and</p> <p>19 I think I would remember.</p> <p>20 Q. And other than your conversations with</p> <p>21 Mr. Seery and counsel, you haven't had any</p> <p>22 conversations with anyone else about these alleged oral</p> <p>23 agreements; is that fair to say?</p> <p>24 A. I'm not sure I understand the question.</p> <p>25 Q. You told me you may have had questions with</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">99</p> <p>1 Q. Is it fair to say that if those payments were</p> <p>2 to be made, it would have been Ms. Hendrix that would</p> <p>3 have gone and effectuated those payments?</p> <p>4 MR. MORRIS: Objection to the form of the</p> <p>5 question.</p> <p>6 THE WITNESS: Can you remind me the entities</p> <p>7 again.</p> <p>8 Q. (BY MR. AIGEN) Sorry. HCMS and HCRE</p> <p>9 Partners.</p> <p>10 A. HCMS, yes. HCRE, I'm not sure, maybe.</p> <p>11 Q. Why might it have been different?</p> <p>12 A. I just don't recall who had the, you know,</p> <p>13 kind of bank access to effectuate that payment. I</p> <p>14 think Kristin did but I'm not certain.</p> <p>15 Q. It wouldn't have been you; is that fair to</p> <p>16 say?</p> <p>17 A. Correct. It would not have been me.</p> <p>18 Q. And if Ms. Hendrix testified that the</p> <p>19 instruction she received in December 2020 about not</p> <p>20 making payments related only to the Advisors and not to</p> <p>21 HMS or HCRE, would you have any reason to disagree with</p> <p>22 her?</p> <p>23 MR. MORRIS: Objection to the form of the</p> <p>24 question.</p> <p>25 THE WITNESS: Yeah, I was struggling with</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">98</p> <p>1 counsel about these oral agreements defense, and you</p> <p>2 told me about conversations with Mr. Seery, so I'm</p> <p>3 trying to close that topic.</p> <p>4 Was there anyone else you had any</p> <p>5 conversations with about this alleged oral agreement?</p> <p>6 A. Like I said before, nothing of substance.</p> <p>7 I've probably mentioned it in passing to other</p> <p>8 employees, this is what I understand is being asserted</p> <p>9 in this, but nothing of substance.</p> <p>10 Q. Do you have any personal knowledge as to</p> <p>11 whether Mr. Dondero or Ms. Dondero entered into any</p> <p>12 type of oral agreement prior to the bankruptcy?</p> <p>13 A. No, not other than what's been pled, or</p> <p>14 whatever the terminology is.</p> <p>15 Q. I want to talk a little bit about, you</p> <p>16 touched on earlier, you gave some testimony about how</p> <p>17 in -- there were certain term loans that had payments</p> <p>18 due in December or on or about December 31, 2020.</p> <p>19 Do you remember talking about that?</p> <p>20 A. Yeah, generally.</p> <p>21 Q. And I don't know if you're specifically</p> <p>22 referring to these loans, but is it also your</p> <p>23 understanding that HCMS and HCRE also had payments that</p> <p>24 were due on December 31, 2020?</p> <p>25 A. Yes.</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">100</p> <p>1 that question. There was a lot to it. If you don't</p> <p>2 mind.</p> <p>3 Q. (BY MR. AIGEN) Okay. I'll repeat it. Maybe</p> <p>4 that will help.</p> <p>5 MR. MORRIS: Why don't you ask him about his</p> <p>6 knowledge, instead of Kristin's. You had her as a</p> <p>7 witness.</p> <p>8 I'll continue to object. I don't know why</p> <p>9 you're asking him about her knowledge.</p> <p>10 MR. AIGEN: Do you want to keep coaching him?</p> <p>11 MR. MORRIS: No, I'm trying to coach you.</p> <p>12 MR. AIGEN: Oh, thanks. That's good.</p> <p>13 Appreciate if you stop coaching your witness.</p> <p>14 Q. (BY MR. AIGEN) If Ms. Hendrix testified that</p> <p>15 the instructions she received in December 2020</p> <p>16 regarding not making any more payments related only to</p> <p>17 the Advisors and not to HMS or HCRE, would you have any</p> <p>18 reason to disagree with her?</p> <p>19 MR. MORRIS: Objection to the form of the</p> <p>20 question.</p> <p>21 THE WITNESS: I have no reason to question</p> <p>22 Kristin's testimony. I'm sure she gave truthful</p> <p>23 testimony.</p> <p>24 Q. (BY MR. AIGEN) Are you aware or not of</p> <p>25 whether Ms. Hendrix was told by Mr. Waterhouse not to</p>

David Klos - October 27, 2021

<p style="text-align: right;">101</p> <p>1 make payments from certain entities in December of 2 2020?</p> <p>3 MR. MORRIS: Objection to the form of the 4 question.</p> <p>5 THE WITNESS: Yeah, I'm aware, and I think I 6 spoke to that earlier of the instruction that had come 7 down from Dondero through Frank to Kristin, and I was 8 certainly aware of it.</p> <p>9 And I'm -- and I think I spoke to the fact 10 that, you know, certainly hearing it from a person who, 11 as I said before, wasn't really on the team at that 12 point, it was certainly my understanding that that was a 13 global instruction at the time.</p> <p>14 Q. (BY MR. AIGEN) And I want to get into what 15 was actually said and what you remember, so let me ask 16 you this.</p> <p>17 This instruction that came down started from 18 Jim and went to Frank. Is that your understanding?</p> <p>19 A. That's my understanding.</p> <p>20 Q. You weren't there during that discussion I 21 assume; is that correct?</p> <p>22 A. Correct, I was not.</p> <p>23 Q. And then Frank gave an instruction to 24 Kristin; is that your recollection?</p> <p>25 MR. MORRIS: Objection to the form of the</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">103</p> <p>1 Q. When you say it was conveyed to you, are you 2 talking about subsequent discussions that you had with 3 Ms. Hendrix and Mr. Waterhouse after they talked to 4 each other?</p> <p>5 A. Yes.</p> <p>6 Q. Sitting here today, can you tell me for sure 7 that one of them told you that this instruction related 8 to all of the entities, as opposed to just the 9 Advisors?</p> <p>10 A. No, I can't say that with certainty, but I 11 think that that was the case. But, again, I can't say 12 with certainty.</p> <p>13 Q. Would you defer to Mr. Waterhouse and 14 Ms. Hendrix over what the specific instructions were?</p> <p>15 MR. MORRIS: Objection to the form of the 16 question.</p> <p>17 THE WITNESS: Like I said, I wasn't part of 18 the conversation, so I would defer to people who 19 received the directions more directly.</p> <p>20 Q. (BY MR. AIGEN) And you're not aware of 21 anything in writing or anything that reflects these 22 instructions on whether to pay or not to pay certain 23 payments in December of 2020?</p> <p>24 A. No, I'm not aware of anything in writing.</p> <p>25 Q. And let's change topics for a second here.</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">102</p> <p>1 question.</p> <p>2 THE WITNESS: Yeah, it's my understanding 3 that Frank informed Kristin of that instruction.</p> <p>4 Q. (BY MR. AIGEN) Were you there when Frank 5 provided this instruction to Kristin?</p> <p>6 A. I don't believe I was.</p> <p>7 Q. Then can I ask, how did you become aware that 8 Frank had given this instruction to Kristin?</p> <p>9 A. Through subsequent conversations with Frank 10 and Kristin. As I said before, I don't recall if it 11 was the three of us or me and Frank or me and Kristin. 12 But subsequent conversations.</p> <p>13 Q. Are we talking about conversations back in 14 2020 or after the bankruptcy?</p> <p>15 MR. MORRIS: Objection to the form of the 16 question.</p> <p>17 THE WITNESS: During 2020, December of 2020.</p> <p>18 Q. (BY MR. AIGEN) Sitting here today, can you 19 say with a hundred percent certainty that the 20 instruction related to all of the entities as opposed 21 to just Advisors?</p> <p>22 A. So as you pointed out, I was not party to the 23 direction, so I have no way of knowing with any sort of 24 specificity what the direction actually was. I just 25 know how it was conveyed to me and how I understood it.</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">104</p> <p>1 I want to throw out a term. Are you familiar 2 with the term "NAV ratio trigger period" as it was used 3 in --</p> <p>4 A. In a very, very general sense, yes.</p> <p>5 Q. And in a general sense what does that term 6 mean to you?</p> <p>7 A. It's a term I recognize from the limited 8 partnership agreement of HCMLP. It's a defined term in 9 that agreement.</p> <p>10 Q. To your knowledge, was the NAV ratio trigger 11 period ever reached or triggered prior to the Highland 12 bankruptcy?</p> <p>13 A. I don't know the definition, so I don't know 14 based on the definition whether it had or hadn't.</p> <p>15 Q. Sitting here today, though, it's not your 16 belief, based on your experience, that it was 17 triggered; is that fair to say?</p> <p>18 MR. MORRIS: Objection to the form of the 19 question.</p> <p>20 THE WITNESS: I don't know the consequence of 21 being in a trigger period, I guess is what -- how I'm 22 trying to answer your question.</p> <p>23 Q. (BY MR. AIGEN) Have you ever had any 24 conversations with Nancy Dondero?</p> <p>25 A. Yes.</p>

David Klos - October 27, 2021

<p style="text-align: right;">105</p> <p>1 Q. Generally, how many and what was the 2 reasoning? 3 A. Probably less than five. I think maybe only 4 one or two that I can really remember. 5 Q. At a high level what were those conversations 6 about? 7 A. From my recollection of my conversations with 8 her, they pertained to the DRIP, which is a dividend 9 reinvestment program that I helped. 10 Q. And approximately when were these 11 conversations? 12 A. I don't know. Sometime between 2017 and 13 probably 2019. I couldn't tell you with any 14 specificity. These were very informal. 15 Q. Fair to say that you've never had any 16 conversations with Nancy Dondero about any of the loans 17 at issue in this case? 18 A. No, no, no, I've never had a conversation 19 with her like that. 20 Q. And fair to say that you've never had any 21 conversations with Nancy Dondero about compensation for 22 Jim or any other officers at Highland? 23 A. Correct. 24 MR. AIGEN: Why don't we go off the record 25 for two minutes. I think I'm either done or about</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">107</p> <p>1 Can you just generally explain to me what 2 services Highland Capital Management provided for 3 HCMS and HCRE? 4 A. For HCMS -- I do need to separate these a 5 little bit. For HCMS, really full-service accounting, 6 tax, treasury, cash payments. I said tax. Valuation. 7 Nothing personnel-wise because they didn't have any 8 employees. 9 That's all I can think of right off the top 10 of my head, but I could be missing some. 11 Q. And what about HCRE? How is that different? 12 A. Similar, except different types of assets. 13 So more real estate, so less heavy. 14 Maybe not necessarily differences in terms of 15 the types of services, but services would have, I'd 16 say, more cash activity, more variety of investments, 17 which triggers different types of activities going on 18 at those entities. 19 But similar in terms of tax operations, 20 making payments. HCRE didn't have employees, so no 21 payroll. So these would be the broad areas that I 22 would think about. 23 Q. And you mentioned making payments. Would one 24 of those services that Highland provided for these two 25 entities include making loan payments on the term loans</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">106</p> <p>1 done. 2 (Off the record.) 3 Q. (BY MR. AIGEN) You understand you're still 4 under oath? 5 A. Yes. 6 Q. Are you aware of any loans that Highland has 7 made to any employees or officers that were forgiven in 8 all or in part? 9 A. Yes. 10 Q. Can you tell me who? 11 A. I don't know that this will be a complete 12 list, but there were a few employees in the kind of 13 late aughts, maybe 2010, 2011 frame. 14 Q. Do you know the names? 15 A. One was Jack Yang. Another, I'm not sure if 16 it was forgiven or not, that's why I'm hesitating, but 17 it was Tim Lawler. I think his was forgiven in part or 18 in full, but I'm not a hundred percent certain. 19 Q. And any other individuals that received loans 20 that were forgiven in part that you're aware of? 21 A. Not that I recall, but there could be others. 22 Some of this is very, very old. 23 Q. Changing topics here a little bit, I'm going 24 to combine two entities to try to speed this up. If 25 you need to separate, that's fine.</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">108</p> <p>1 like the term loans at issue in these proceedings? 2 MR. MORRIS: Objection to the form of the 3 question. 4 THE WITNESS: I think I mentioned before, I 5 couldn't remember whether or not Kristin was authorized 6 to make payments with respect to HCRE. I think she 7 probably was, but I don't know that with certainty. 8 But, you know, for services, certainly Kristin 9 and her team would be responsible for making those 10 payments, subject to the proper authorization. 11 Q. (BY MR. AIGEN) And I'm sorry if I asked this 12 before. If it wasn't Kristin for HCRE, do you have an 13 idea who it would have been? 14 A. If not Kristin, it would have been Melissa 15 Schroth. 16 Q. And how were those responsibilities split up? 17 What entities was Melissa Schroth responsible for? 18 A. Generally speaking, Melissa was more 19 responsible for entities that were really, like -- I'm 20 going to use this in the most general sense, like Jim 21 entities, Jim's trusts, Jim personally. 22 And for HCRE it was kind of in the middle. 23 When it started out it kind of was more Jim world and 24 then over time it got more complex. 25 And as entities got more complex over time</p>

David Klos - October 27, 2021

<p style="text-align: right;">109</p> <p>1 they tend to get transitioned from Melissa to corporate 2 accounting. And when they got really complex over to 3 another group of fund accountants. 4 So this is one that was, at its beginning, 5 Melissa was the, called primary accountant. And at 6 some point in time that transitioned to the corporate 7 accounting team. I can't remember when the cash 8 process kind of cut over. 9 Q. Is there a list somewhere saying Melissa is 10 responsible for these, Kristin for the others, or is it 11 just more of a pattern or matter of practice? 12 A. More of a matter of practice. If you're 13 responsible for an entity, you're responsible. If 14 you're not, then you're not. 15 MR. AIGEN: That's all the questions I have. 16 Thank you for your time. 17 THE WITNESS: Thank you. 18 EXAMINATION 19 Q. (BY MR. MORRIS) Just a few, Mr. Klos. Let's 20 pick up where Mr. Aigen left off. 21 To the best of your knowledge, did HCMS have 22 a shared services agreement with Highland? 23 A. No, it didn't that I'm aware of. 24 Q. But you described certain services that HCMLP 25 provided to HCMS; is that right?</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">111</p> <p>1 that was due at the end of the year? 2 A. Yes, we continued to track it through our 3 interest schedules and through cash. 4 Q. So in the debtor's books and records is there 5 any evidence that the payments that were made in early 6 2019 were intended to relieve NexPoint's obligation to 7 make the installment payment due at the end of the 8 year? 9 MR. RUKAVINA: Objection. Best evidence. 10 THE WITNESS: No, I don't believe so. 11 Q. (BY MR. MORRIS) Did you have a conversation 12 with anybody at any time in the year 2019 about whether 13 the payments made earlier in the year on behalf of 14 NexPoint would eliminate or suspend its obligation -- 15 withdrawn. 16 Did you have any conversation with anybody -- 17 I think I screwed up the dates. Going to have to start 18 over. 19 Let me ask better questions. 20 You looked with Mr. Rukavina at certain 21 payments that were made in early 2019 with respect to 22 the NexPoint note. 23 Do I have that right? 24 A. Yes. 25 Q. Notwithstanding those payments, did NexPoint</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">110</p> <p>1 A. Yes. 2 Q. Do you know whether HCMFA ever compensated -- 3 do you know whether HCMS ever compensated HCMLP for any 4 of those services that HCMLP provided? 5 A. No, it didn't. 6 Q. You mentioned HCRE. To the best of your 7 knowledge, did HCRE have a shared services agreement 8 with Highland Capital Management, LP? 9 A. No, it didn't. 10 Q. Did HCRE provide the services that -- 11 withdrawn. 12 Did HCMLP provide the services to HCRE that 13 you just described? 14 A. Yes. 15 Q. Did HCRE ever compensate HCMLP for any of the 16 services that HCMLP provided? 17 A. No. 18 Q. Okay. Mr. Rukavina asked you some questions 19 about payments that were made on the NexPoint loan in 20 the first half of 2019. 21 Do you remember that? 22 A. Yes, generally. 23 Q. Okay. Notwithstanding those payments, did 24 your group continue to carry on its books and records 25 NexPoint's obligation to make the installment payment</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">112</p> <p>1 make the installment payment that was due at the end of 2 2019? 3 MR. RUKAVINA: Objection. Calls for a legal 4 conclusion. 5 THE WITNESS: It did make the payment that 6 was due at the end of 2019. 7 Q. (BY MR. MORRIS) And the payment that it made 8 at the end of 2019, was that the annual installment 9 payment that was called for in the note itself? 10 MR. RUKAVINA: Objection. Legal conclusion. 11 THE WITNESS: Yes, it was a payment pursuant 12 to the note. 13 Q. (BY MR. MORRIS) Did anybody ever tell you at 14 any time prior to the commencement of this lawsuit that 15 any prior payment by or on behalf of NexPoint relieved 16 it of any obligation to pay the installment payment due 17 at the end of 2020? 18 A. No. 19 Q. And did in fact -- is it your understanding 20 that Mr. Dondero specifically authorized Highland to 21 effectuate a payment on NexPoint's behalf in mid 22 January 2021? 23 A. I don't have specific knowledge, but I know 24 that to have occurred. 25 Q. Okay. Did anybody ever tell you in 2021 --</p>

David Klos - October 27, 2021

<p style="text-align: right;">113</p> <p>1 withdrawn.</p> <p>2 Did anybody tell you in December 2020 or</p> <p>3 December -- or January 2021 that NexPoint didn't have</p> <p>4 to make the installment payment at year end 2020</p> <p>5 because of some prior prepayment?</p> <p>6 A. No.</p> <p>7 Q. Can you think of any reason -- withdrawn.</p> <p>8 Did you ever hear Mr. Dondero -- withdrawn.</p> <p>9 Did you ever see anything in writing where</p> <p>10 NexPoint ever contended, prior to February 1, 2021,</p> <p>11 that it had no obligation to make the payment due at</p> <p>12 the end of 2020 because of some prepayment issue?</p> <p>13 A. No, not that I remember.</p> <p>14 Q. Can you think of any reason why Mr. Dondero</p> <p>15 would have authorized a payment by NexPoint to HCMLP on</p> <p>16 account of the note in January of 2021 if he actually</p> <p>17 believed at that time that no obligation was due</p> <p>18 because of a prior prepayment?</p> <p>19 MR. RUKAVINA: Objection. Speculation, lacks</p> <p>20 foundation.</p> <p>21 THE WITNESS: No.</p> <p>22 Q. (BY MR. MORRIS) Does it make any sense to</p> <p>23 you as an accountant that you would pay a seven-figure</p> <p>24 sum of money that you didn't think was due and owing?</p> <p>25 A. No, that does not make sense to me.</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">115</p> <p>1 Q. And you sent it to the corporate accounting</p> <p>2 email group; is that right?</p> <p>3 A. I did.</p> <p>4 Q. And to the best of your recollection, was</p> <p>5 Mr. Waterhouse included in that email group?</p> <p>6 A. Yes, absolutely.</p> <p>7 Q. And did you instruct the corporate accounting</p> <p>8 team to transfer \$2.4 million from HCMLP to HCMFA on</p> <p>9 May 2, 2019?</p> <p>10 A. Yes, specifically Blair, but yes, for the</p> <p>11 team as well.</p> <p>12 Q. The whole team was aware of this?</p> <p>13 A. The whole team is on the email, and I'm</p> <p>14 sending to Blair, who is the AP person, to please set</p> <p>15 up the payment.</p> <p>16 Q. Is it fair to say that you're being</p> <p>17 completely transparent here by including the entire</p> <p>18 corporate accounting group on this email?</p> <p>19 A. Yes.</p> <p>20 Q. And did you tell the entire corporate</p> <p>21 accounting group that this transaction would be a,</p> <p>22 quote, new interco loan?</p> <p>23 A. Yes, that's what the email says.</p> <p>24 Q. Do you have any reason to believe that</p> <p>25 Mr. Waterhouse didn't get this?</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">114</p> <p>1 Q. Can you get Exhibit 13, please.</p> <p>2 A. Got it.</p> <p>3 Q. You were asked some questions about</p> <p>4 paragraph 3.</p> <p>5 Do you see that?</p> <p>6 A. Yes.</p> <p>7 Q. Does paragraph 3 mention annual installment</p> <p>8 payments at all?</p> <p>9 A. No, I'm not seeing it.</p> <p>10 Q. Does paragraph 3 state in any way that a</p> <p>11 prepayment as described in that paragraph would relieve</p> <p>12 the maker of the obligation to make annual installment</p> <p>13 payments?</p> <p>14 A. No.</p> <p>15 Q. Can you turn to the next page and look at</p> <p>16 paragraph 5.</p> <p>17 Are you familiar with that paragraph at all?</p> <p>18 A. No. I mean, I've seen it before, but this</p> <p>19 is, as I said before, this is a provision that probably</p> <p>20 would have been in most, if not all, of these types of</p> <p>21 notes.</p> <p>22 Q. Can you get Exhibit 3, please. This is your</p> <p>23 email dated May 2, 2019.</p> <p>24 Do I have that right?</p> <p>25 A. Yes.</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">116</p> <p>1 A. No, he got this.</p> <p>2 Q. And did Mr. Waterhouse tell you at any time</p> <p>3 in the history of the world that this \$2.4 million</p> <p>4 should not have been booked as a loan?</p> <p>5 A. No.</p> <p>6 Q. Did Mr. Dondero tell you at any moment in the</p> <p>7 history of the world that this transaction should not</p> <p>8 have been booked as a loan?</p> <p>9 A. No.</p> <p>10 Q. You mentioned that there was an audit that</p> <p>11 followed shortly thereafter?</p> <p>12 A. Yes.</p> <p>13 Q. Are you familiar with the debtor's audited</p> <p>14 financial statements for the period ending 2018?</p> <p>15 A. Yes, generally. Not total recall, but yes.</p> <p>16 Q. Are you aware that this loan was included as</p> <p>17 a subsequent event in the debtor's audited financial</p> <p>18 statements?</p> <p>19 A. Yes.</p> <p>20 MR. RUKAVINA: Objection. Best evidence.</p> <p>21 Q. (BY MR. MORRIS) Did Mr. Dondero or</p> <p>22 Mr. Waterhouse or anybody ever tell you that the debtor</p> <p>23 should not have included this \$2.4 million loan in its</p> <p>24 audited financial statements?</p> <p>25 MR. RUKAVINA: Objection. Best evidence.</p>

David Klos - October 27, 2021

<p style="text-align: right;">117</p> <p>1 THE WITNESS: No.</p> <p>2 Q. (BY MR. MORRIS) Okay. And the next day</p> <p>3 there was another loan; right?</p> <p>4 A. Yes.</p> <p>5 Q. I'm going to show you here a document that's</p> <p>6 been produced.</p> <p>7 MR. RUKAVINA: Would you email it to me and I</p> <p>8 can print it out for the court reporter.</p> <p>9 MR. MORRIS: You want to come over here and</p> <p>10 look --</p> <p>11 MR. RUKAVINA: I know it. I'm just thinking</p> <p>12 that we can append it to the record right now.</p> <p>13 MR. MORRIS: It's eight pages, so it's part</p> <p>14 of a whole production.</p> <p>15 MR. RUKAVINA: But it's just one email?</p> <p>16 MR. MORRIS: Just one email that I'm talking</p> <p>17 about. So we're looking at Bates stamp D-CNL003763.</p> <p>18 And I'll email it to you when we're done here.</p> <p>19 And you're welcome to come over here if you'd like to</p> <p>20 see it.</p> <p>21 Q. (BY MR. MORRIS) Mr. Klos, can you take a</p> <p>22 look at the email that I have on my screen.</p> <p>23 A. Yes.</p> <p>24 Q. And do you see that it's an email from</p> <p>25 Kristin Hendrix to the corporate accounting group on</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">119</p> <p>1 A. No.</p> <p>2 Q. Did anybody in the history of the world ever</p> <p>3 raise a question to you as to whether or not Kristin</p> <p>4 was authorized to paper the loan, as she describes it</p> <p>5 in this particular email?</p> <p>6 A. No.</p> <p>7 Q. Do you know if this \$5 million loan was also</p> <p>8 included in the debtor's audited financial statements?</p> <p>9 MR. RUKAVINA: Objection. Best evidence.</p> <p>10 THE WITNESS: Yes. Again, subsequent event.</p> <p>11 Q. (BY MR. MORRIS) Okay. And did anybody in</p> <p>12 the history of the world ever tell you that Highland</p> <p>13 should not have included as a subsequent event in its</p> <p>14 2018 audited financial statement this \$5 million loan?</p> <p>15 A. No.</p> <p>16 MR. RUKAVINA: Objection. Best evidence.</p> <p>17 THE WITNESS: No.</p> <p>18 Q. (BY MR. MORRIS) Do you know if HCMFA had its</p> <p>19 financial statements audited?</p> <p>20 A. It did.</p> <p>21 Q. And are you generally familiar with those</p> <p>22 financial statements?</p> <p>23 A. Yes.</p> <p>24 Q. Are you aware that these two loans totaling</p> <p>25 \$7.4 million were included in HCMFA's audited financial</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">118</p> <p>1 Friday, May 3?</p> <p>2 A. Yes.</p> <p>3 Q. And were you also included in the corporate</p> <p>4 accounting email string?</p> <p>5 A. Yes.</p> <p>6 Q. Can you read the email out loud, please.</p> <p>7 A. It says, Blair, please set up a wire from</p> <p>8 HCMLP to HCMFA for 5 million as a new loan,</p> <p>9 parentheses, 4.4 million should be coming in from Jim</p> <p>10 soon. Hayley, please add this to your loan tracker. I</p> <p>11 will paper the loan.</p> <p>12 Q. So based on that email, did you understand on</p> <p>13 May 3 that HCMLP was going to loan \$5 million to HCMFA?</p> <p>14 A. Yes, HCMFA.</p> <p>15 Q. And did you understand that Kristin</p> <p>16 specifically told the corporate accounting group that</p> <p>17 she would take responsibility for papering the loan?</p> <p>18 A. Yes, that's what she says.</p> <p>19 Q. Do you recall whether Mr. Waterhouse ever</p> <p>20 objected to any aspect of Kristin's email?</p> <p>21 A. He didn't.</p> <p>22 Q. Do you recall in the history of the world</p> <p>23 whether Mr. Waterhouse ever told you that this</p> <p>24 \$5 million transaction should not have been booked as a</p> <p>25 loan?</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">120</p> <p>1 statements as a subsequent event for the period ended</p> <p>2 December 31, 2018?</p> <p>3 A. Yes.</p> <p>4 MR. RUKAVINA: Objection. Best evidence.</p> <p>5 Q. (BY MR. MORRIS) Did anybody in the history</p> <p>6 of the world ever tell you that HCMFA should not have</p> <p>7 included as a subsequent event the borrowing of the</p> <p>8 money reflected in these loans?</p> <p>9 MR. RUKAVINA: Objection. Best evidence.</p> <p>10 THE WITNESS: No, no one said that.</p> <p>11 Q. (BY MR. MORRIS) Do you know if HCMFA</p> <p>12 included these loans as a liability on its balance</p> <p>13 sheet?</p> <p>14 A. It did.</p> <p>15 MR. RUKAVINA: Objection. Move to strike.</p> <p>16 Best evidence.</p> <p>17 Q. (BY MR. MORRIS) Did anyone in the history of</p> <p>18 the world ever tell you that HCMFA should not have</p> <p>19 included these loans as a liability on its balance</p> <p>20 sheet?</p> <p>21 MR. RUKAVINA: Objection. Best evidence.</p> <p>22 THE WITNESS: No.</p> <p>23 Q. (BY MR. MORRIS) Okay. Do you recall that in</p> <p>24 October of 2020 HCMFA and NexPoint made a report to the</p> <p>25 retail board?</p>

David Klos - October 27, 2021

<p style="text-align: right;">121</p> <p>1 A. Yes.</p> <p>2 Q. And are you aware that that's part of the</p> <p>3 annual review process?</p> <p>4 A. Yes, it's the 15(c) process.</p> <p>5 Q. By the way, as we're talking about these</p> <p>6 issues, did Mr. Waterhouse have -- was he an officer of</p> <p>7 HCMFA in 2019 and 2020?</p> <p>8 A. Yes.</p> <p>9 Q. And what's your understanding as to the</p> <p>10 office he held?</p> <p>11 A. Treasurer, I believe.</p> <p>12 Q. And do you know if Mr. Dondero held an</p> <p>13 officer position with respect to each of the Advisors?</p> <p>14 A. He did.</p> <p>15 Q. What position did he hold?</p> <p>16 A. I don't recall with certainty, but I believe</p> <p>17 president.</p> <p>18 Q. As officers of those two entities, do you</p> <p>19 have any knowledge as to whether they participated in</p> <p>20 the communications with the retail board in the fall of</p> <p>21 2020?</p> <p>22 A. I believe Jim and Frank both did.</p> <p>23 Q. And do you know whether the retail board</p> <p>24 asked the Advisors for a report on all obligations due</p> <p>25 and owing to HCMLP and affiliates?</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">123</p> <p>1 A. Not that I'm aware of.</p> <p>2 Q. You referred to a couple of loans that were</p> <p>3 given to individuals earlier.</p> <p>4 Do you remember that?</p> <p>5 A. Yes.</p> <p>6 Q. What's the biggest loan that you can recall</p> <p>7 Highland ever forgiving?</p> <p>8 A. The largest one that I can remember was</p> <p>9 a half-million dollars, 500,000.</p> <p>10 Q. So you have no knowledge of any loan ever</p> <p>11 being forgiven where the principal amount forgiven</p> <p>12 exceeded \$500,000; is that right?</p> <p>13 A. Not that I'm aware of.</p> <p>14 Q. And when is the last loan that Highland</p> <p>15 forgave in whole or in part to one of its officers or</p> <p>16 employees that you can recall?</p> <p>17 A. I don't know a specific year, but it would</p> <p>18 have been in the 2010, 2011 time frame. Maybe 2012,</p> <p>19 but I suspect '10 or '11.</p> <p>20 Q. So is it fair to say to the best of your</p> <p>21 recollection and knowledge that Highland did not</p> <p>22 forgive a single loan made to an officer or employee</p> <p>23 for at least seven years prior to the petition date?</p> <p>24 A. There's none that I can think of.</p> <p>25 Q. Let's just turn our attention to</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">122</p> <p>1 A. They asked for financials, I believe as of</p> <p>2 6/30 as part of that process.</p> <p>3 Q. And are you aware as to whether or not the</p> <p>4 financials that were provided to the retail board</p> <p>5 included, among other things, the \$7.4 million in notes</p> <p>6 that were -- that we're talking about here?</p> <p>7 A. Yes, those financials would have included</p> <p>8 those amounts as liabilities to HCMLP.</p> <p>9 Q. Did Mr. Dondero or Mr. Waterhouse ever tell</p> <p>10 you or anybody to your knowledge that the Advisors</p> <p>11 should not have told the retail boards that they were</p> <p>12 obligated to pay under those two notes?</p> <p>13 A. No.</p> <p>14 Q. Let's talk about loan forgiveness for a</p> <p>15 moment.</p> <p>16 How long have you been with the company?</p> <p>17 A. March of 2009.</p> <p>18 Q. At any time since you've been employed by</p> <p>19 Highland, has Highland ever forgiven a promissory note</p> <p>20 that it held where the maker was a corporate affiliate?</p> <p>21 A. Not that I can recall.</p> <p>22 Q. Have you ever heard prior -- has anybody ever</p> <p>23 told you that before you joined the company, Highland</p> <p>24 had ever forgiven in whole or in part any note that it</p> <p>25 held where the maker was a corporate affiliate?</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">124</p> <p>1 December 2020.</p> <p>2 Do you recall that you testified at length</p> <p>3 about your understanding of the conversations with</p> <p>4 Mr. Waterhouse and Ms. Hendrix?</p> <p>5 Do you remember that?</p> <p>6 A. Yes.</p> <p>7 Q. Okay. Are you aware of any instruction ever</p> <p>8 made by Mr. Dondero or Mr. Waterhouse in November or</p> <p>9 December 2020 in order to make the payments that were</p> <p>10 due under the three term notes -- withdrawn.</p> <p>11 There were three term notes that were due --</p> <p>12 withdrawn.</p> <p>13 There are three term notes at issue in this</p> <p>14 case. Do you understand that?</p> <p>15 A. Yeah, that's my understanding.</p> <p>16 Q. And one of them was issued by NexBank; is</p> <p>17 that right?</p> <p>18 A. NexPoint Advisors.</p> <p>19 Q. Thank you for the clarification.</p> <p>20 One was by HCRE?</p> <p>21 A. Correct.</p> <p>22 Q. And one was from HCMS; do I have that right?</p> <p>23 A. Yes.</p> <p>24 Q. And all three of those notes were executed as</p> <p>25 of May 31, 2017; right?</p>

David Klos - October 27, 2021

<p style="text-align: right;">125</p> <p>1 A. Yeah, that was the effective date on all</p> <p>2 three.</p> <p>3 Q. And they all rolled up previously outstanding</p> <p>4 notes that were due and payable to Highland.</p> <p>5 Do I have that right?</p> <p>6 A. Correct. To the best of my recollection.</p> <p>7 Q. So we'll refer to those notes as the term</p> <p>8 notes. Is that okay?</p> <p>9 A. Sure.</p> <p>10 Q. Do you have any knowledge that Mr. Dondero or</p> <p>11 Mr. Waterhouse ever instructed HCMLP to make the</p> <p>12 installment payments that were due at the end of 2020</p> <p>13 with respect to any of those term notes?</p> <p>14 A. No, I don't believe they provided that</p> <p>15 instruction to make those payments.</p> <p>16 MR. RUKAVINA: Objection. Move to strike.</p> <p>17 Lacks foundation.</p> <p>18 MR. MORRIS: I'm asking him if he ever heard.</p> <p>19 MR. RUKAVINA: But he answered a different</p> <p>20 question. He answered a different question.</p> <p>21 Q. (BY MR. MORRIS) Did you ever see anything in</p> <p>22 writing where either Mr. Dondero or Mr. Waterhouse</p> <p>23 directed HCMLP to make the annual installment payments</p> <p>24 that were due at the end of 2020 with respect to any of</p> <p>25 the term notes?</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">127</p> <p>1 FURTHER EXAMINATION</p> <p>2 Q. (BY MR. RUKAVINA) Go to Exhibit 16, please,</p> <p>3 1-6.</p> <p>4 A. Sure.</p> <p>5 Q. Sir, this is an email string regarding that</p> <p>6 Rule 15(c) that you were talking about. I'm just going</p> <p>7 to ask you about the top email, but you're welcome to</p> <p>8 read the whole.</p> <p>9 A. Uh-huh.</p> <p>10 Q. You're copied on Mr. Waterhouse's email there</p> <p>11 October 6, 2020; right?</p> <p>12 A. Yes, I'm on the email.</p> <p>13 Q. And Mr. Waterhouse writes, the HCMFA note is</p> <p>14 a demand note. You would have read that; right?</p> <p>15 A. Yes.</p> <p>16 Q. Did you ever correct Mr. Waterhouse when he</p> <p>17 says the HCMFA note, as opposed to notes?</p> <p>18 A. No, that's not something I would have</p> <p>19 corrected from Frank.</p> <p>20 Q. Do you recall right now that you might have,</p> <p>21 when you read this, realized that he made a mistake?</p> <p>22 A. It would have been such a de minimus,</p> <p>23 inconsequential mistake that I don't know that I would</p> <p>24 have addressed it.</p> <p>25 Q. What about two sentences over, there was an</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">126</p> <p>1 A. No.</p> <p>2 Q. Okay. But to the best of your recollection,</p> <p>3 in the 13-week forecast, those forecasts included the</p> <p>4 installment payments that were due at the end of the</p> <p>5 year; is that right?</p> <p>6 A. They did.</p> <p>7 Q. Did anybody ever tell you prior to</p> <p>8 February 1, 2021, that your group had made a mistake by</p> <p>9 not making the payment -- any of the payments that were</p> <p>10 due under the term notes at the end of 2020?</p> <p>11 A. Not that I'm aware of.</p> <p>12 Q. Did anybody tell you prior to February 1,</p> <p>13 2021, that the makers of the term notes expected</p> <p>14 Highland to effectuate the payments that were due at</p> <p>15 the end of the year without approval by Mr. Waterhouse</p> <p>16 or Mr. Dondero?</p> <p>17 A. No.</p> <p>18 Q. Have you seen any protest in writing prior to</p> <p>19 the commencement of the litigation by any of the makers</p> <p>20 of the notes about a failure on the part of HCMLP to</p> <p>21 perform its duties and make that payment at the end of</p> <p>22 the year?</p> <p>23 A. No.</p> <p>24 MR. MORRIS: I have no further questions.</p> <p>25 MR. RUKAVINA: I have five minutes.</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">128</p> <p>1 agreement between HCMLP and HCMFA the earliest they</p> <p>2 could demand is May 2021.</p> <p>3 Did you ever write to him and say that too</p> <p>4 was a mistake?</p> <p>5 A. I didn't write to him.</p> <p>6 Q. Did you realize back then when you read it</p> <p>7 that he had made a mistake?</p> <p>8 A. I'm not certain.</p> <p>9 Q. Did you -- and I'm not suggesting that you</p> <p>10 should have. You're a busy man. But did you attach</p> <p>11 any significance outside of the ordinary to this email</p> <p>12 exchange?</p> <p>13 MR. MORRIS: Objection to the form of the</p> <p>14 question.</p> <p>15 THE WITNESS: I struggle with how to answer</p> <p>16 that. I saw that this note was in response to retail</p> <p>17 15(c) follow-up on the Advisors.</p> <p>18 At this point my role was different, where I</p> <p>19 was dealing with really the retail funds primarily. So</p> <p>20 the fact that I'm even on this email is somewhat</p> <p>21 incidental.</p> <p>22 Q. (BY MR. RUKAVINA) But surely on October 6,</p> <p>23 2020 you knew that there were four HCMFA demand notes,</p> <p>24 didn't you?</p> <p>25 A. I'm sure I would have had access to that</p>

David Klos - October 27, 2021

<p style="text-align: right;">129</p> <p>1 information. I'm not sure that I was keeping track of</p> <p>2 how many were outstanding at any given point in time.</p> <p>3 Q. And surely on October 6, 2020 you knew that</p> <p>4 only two of them couldn't be demanded by May of 2021,</p> <p>5 didn't you?</p> <p>6 A. Again, I don't know that I was even really</p> <p>7 thinking about these notes at that time.</p> <p>8 Q. Even though you were preparing weekly cash</p> <p>9 forecasts for Mr. Seery?</p> <p>10 A. I wasn't preparing a weekly cash forecast for</p> <p>11 Mr. Seery.</p> <p>12 Q. Going to Exhibit 13, please. Mr. Morris</p> <p>13 asked you a couple questions about this.</p> <p>14 A. I'm sorry, 13?</p> <p>15 Q. Yes, sir. And again, that paragraph 3 that</p> <p>16 talks about prepayment.</p> <p>17 Can you find anything in here, sir, that says</p> <p>18 that a prepayment does not relieve the maker of any</p> <p>19 regularly scheduled payment?</p> <p>20 A. Sorry, that's a lot to comprehend. If you</p> <p>21 could ask again.</p> <p>22 Q. Is there any provision that you can see here</p> <p>23 that's to the effect that a prepayment will not relieve</p> <p>24 the maker of any regularly scheduled payment?</p> <p>25 A. I don't see that specific provision. I just</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">131</p> <p>1 Q. And Mr. Morris asked you whether you see</p> <p>2 anything in here that says that a prepayment relieves</p> <p>3 an annual installment.</p> <p>4 Do you remember that question?</p> <p>5 MR. MORRIS: Objection. That's not what I</p> <p>6 asked.</p> <p>7 THE WITNESS: I don't remember that question.</p> <p>8 Q. (BY MR. RUKAVINA) Reading Section 2.1 and 3</p> <p>9 together, what would a prepayment apply to other than</p> <p>10 an annual installment? Do you have a view on that?</p> <p>11 MR. MORRIS: Objection to the form of the</p> <p>12 question.</p> <p>13 THE WITNESS: Again, I struggle with</p> <p>14 prepayment. But as I read Section 3, it would be</p> <p>15 applied first to unpaid accrued interest and then to</p> <p>16 unpaid principal.</p> <p>17 Q. (BY MR. RUKAVINA) Have you ever in your</p> <p>18 personal life prepaid a promissory note before -- have</p> <p>19 you ever in your personal life prepaid a promissory</p> <p>20 note prior to its maturity?</p> <p>21 MR. MORRIS: Objection to the form of the</p> <p>22 question.</p> <p>23 THE WITNESS: I don't know.</p> <p>24 Q. (BY MR. RUKAVINA) Sitting here today, with</p> <p>25 your CPA, your MBA and you're a CFO of a large entity,</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">130</p> <p>1 read it for what is on the page.</p> <p>2 Q. Isn't it, sir, in your experience the case</p> <p>3 that a promissory note, if it intended not to relieve</p> <p>4 the borrower of regularly scheduled payments would say</p> <p>5 that a prepayment does not relieve the borrower of</p> <p>6 regularly scheduled payments?</p> <p>7 MR. MORRIS: Objection to the form of the</p> <p>8 question.</p> <p>9 THE WITNESS: That's a legal question. I</p> <p>10 can't -- I don't know the answer.</p> <p>11 Q. (BY MR. RUKAVINA) Do you remember seeing</p> <p>12 promissory notes that say something like that?</p> <p>13 A. Not that I can recall.</p> <p>14 Q. You'd be surprised if that's what promissory</p> <p>15 notes say?</p> <p>16 MR. MORRIS: Objection to the form of the</p> <p>17 question.</p> <p>18 THE WITNESS: I don't know.</p> <p>19 Q. (BY MR. RUKAVINA) And Mr. Morris asked you</p> <p>20 about this. I'm trying to burn through this so the man</p> <p>21 can make his plane.</p> <p>22 Section 2.1 talks about 30 equal annual</p> <p>23 payments, annual installments.</p> <p>24 You see that?</p> <p>25 A. Yes, I see that.</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">132</p> <p>1 you don't understand what a prepayment means?</p> <p>2 MR. MORRIS: Objection. Argumentative.</p> <p>3 I direct you not to answer.</p> <p>4 You're going to have ask a different question.</p> <p>5 That's an argumentative question and it's insulting.</p> <p>6 MR. RUKAVINA: What's the privilege on which</p> <p>7 you're directing him not to answer?</p> <p>8 MR. MORRIS: I just said it's argumentative.</p> <p>9 MR. RUKAVINA: I'm trying to let you get to</p> <p>10 your flight.</p> <p>11 MR. MORRIS: Ask a proper question. Don't</p> <p>12 make this about me.</p> <p>13 Q. (BY MR. RUKAVINA) You were going to answer</p> <p>14 my question, sir?</p> <p>15 MR. MORRIS: No, I'm directing him not to</p> <p>16 answer.</p> <p>17 MR. RUKAVINA: Then we'll end this deposition</p> <p>18 with a motion to compel.</p> <p>19 MR. MORRIS: Okay. You do that.</p> <p>20 MR. RUKAVINA: I'm making a motion to compel.</p> <p>21 We'll call the judge as soon as we land in New York</p> <p>22 tomorrow.</p> <p>23 MR. MORRIS: You have to read the whole</p> <p>24 question. You can ask the question without the</p> <p>25 verbiage; right?</p>

David Klos - October 27, 2021

<p style="text-align: right;">133</p> <p>1 MR. RUKAVINA: And I asked you on the basis</p> <p>2 of what privilege are you instructing your --</p> <p>3 MR. MORRIS: Argumentative.</p> <p>4 MR. RUKAVINA: That's not a privilege.</p> <p>5 MR. MORRIS: Sir, you can rephrase your</p> <p>6 question and end this right now by not being insulting</p> <p>7 to my client.</p> <p>8 Q. (BY MR. RUKAVINA) I was not trying to be</p> <p>9 insulting, sir.</p> <p>10 I'm asking you again, you do not, sitting</p> <p>11 here today, have an understanding of what the word</p> <p>12 "prepayment" for a promissory note means?</p> <p>13 MR. MORRIS: Objection to the form of the</p> <p>14 question.</p> <p>15 You can answer that one.</p> <p>16 THE WITNESS: In the context that you're</p> <p>17 asking the question --</p> <p>18 Q. (BY MR. RUKAVINA) No, I'm not asking any</p> <p>19 context. Sitting here today, do you have an</p> <p>20 understanding of what the word "prepayment" means when</p> <p>21 it comes to a borrower/lender relationship?</p> <p>22 MR. MORRIS: Objection to the form of the</p> <p>23 question.</p> <p>24 THE WITNESS: Yes, I have a general</p> <p>25 understanding.</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">135</p> <p>1 payment made prior to the time that it's due?</p> <p>2 MR. MORRIS: Objection to the form of the</p> <p>3 question.</p> <p>4 THE WITNESS: Yes, in the most general sense</p> <p>5 a prepayment, the prefix "pre" indicates that it's</p> <p>6 before some other event. So from that standpoint,</p> <p>7 prepayment means it was to some extent paid early.</p> <p>8 MR. RUKAVINA: Thank you.</p> <p>9 Pass the witness.</p> <p>10 MR. MORRIS: No further questions.</p> <p>11 Michael?</p> <p>12 MR. AIGEN: No questions.</p> <p>13 THE REPORTER: Mr. Morris, do you want a copy</p> <p>14 of the transcript?</p> <p>15 MR. MORRIS: I sure do.</p> <p>16 THE REPORTER: Mr. Aigen, do you want a copy</p> <p>17 of the transcript?</p> <p>18 MR. AIGEN: Yes, we would also like a copy.</p> <p>19 MR. MORRIS: Yeah, and I'd like that rush.</p> <p>20 (Whereupon, the deposition adjourned at</p> <p>21 5:14 P.M.)</p> <p>22 --oOo--</p> <p>23 I declare under penalty of perjury that the</p> <p>24 foregoing is true and correct. Subscribed at</p> <p>25 _____, Texas, this ____ day of</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">134</p> <p>1 Q. (BY MR. RUKAVINA) What is your</p> <p>2 understanding?</p> <p>3 A. That -- you can look at the note.</p> <p>4 Q. I'm not asking about the note. We got to go</p> <p>5 step by step.</p> <p>6 What is your general understanding as to what</p> <p>7 a prepayment means?</p> <p>8 MR. MORRIS: Objection to the form of the</p> <p>9 question.</p> <p>10 THE WITNESS: It depends on the context and</p> <p>11 it's going to depend on what the note says about</p> <p>12 prepayments. So I have a hard time answering that</p> <p>13 question.</p> <p>14 Q. (BY MR. RUKAVINA) So you would agree with me</p> <p>15 that you have to look at the note before you can answer</p> <p>16 that question?</p> <p>17 MR. MORRIS: Objection to the form of the</p> <p>18 question.</p> <p>19 THE WITNESS: I would want to look at the</p> <p>20 note before I answer the question, because prepayment</p> <p>21 is a term that can be used as a defined term or in a</p> <p>22 casual sense, and those two can sometimes get confused</p> <p>23 and misconstrued.</p> <p>24 Q. (BY MR. RUKAVINA) Would you agree with me</p> <p>25 that in any and all circumstances a prepayment is a</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">136</p> <p>1 _____, 2021.</p> <p>2</p> <p>3</p> <p>4 _____</p> <p>5 DAVID KLOS</p> <p>6</p> <p>7</p> <p>8</p> <p>9</p> <p>10</p> <p>11</p> <p>12</p> <p>13</p> <p>14</p> <p>15</p> <p>16</p> <p>17</p> <p>18</p> <p>19</p> <p>20</p> <p>21</p> <p>22</p> <p>23</p> <p>24</p> <p>25</p>

David Klos - October 27, 2021

<p style="text-align: right;">137</p> <p>1 CERTIFICATE OF REPORTER</p> <p>2 I, BRANDON D. COMBS, a Certified Shorthand</p> <p>3 Reporter, hereby certify that the witness in the</p> <p>4 foregoing deposition was by me duly sworn to tell the</p> <p>5 truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth in the</p> <p>6 within-entitled cause;</p> <p>7 That said deposition was taken in shorthand by</p> <p>8 me, a disinterested person, at the time and place</p> <p>9 therein stated, and that the testimony of the said</p> <p>10 witness was thereafter reduced to typewriting, by</p> <p>11 computer, under my direction and supervision;</p> <p>12 That before completion of the deposition,</p> <p>13 review of the transcript was not requested. If</p> <p>14 requested, any changes made by the deponent (and</p> <p>15 provided to the reporter) during the period allowed are</p> <p>16 appended hereto.</p> <p>17 I further certify that I am not of counsel or</p> <p>18 attorney for either or any of the parties to the said</p> <p>19 deposition, nor in any way interested in the event of</p> <p>20 this cause, and that I am not related to any of the</p> <p>21 parties thereto.</p> <p>22 DATED: November 1, 2021</p> <p>23</p> <p>24 _____</p> <p>25 Brandon Combs, Certified Shorthand</p>	
<p style="text-align: right;">138</p> <p>1 State of Texas</p> <p>2 Dickman Davenport, Inc. Cert 312</p> <p>3 4228 North Central Expressway</p> <p>4 Suite 101, Dallas, TX 75206</p> <p>5 (214) 855-5100 (800) 445-9548</p> <p>6 Email: info@dickmandavenport.com</p> <p>7 www.dickmandavenport.com</p> <p>8 My commission expires 1-31-23</p> <p>9</p> <p>10</p> <p>11</p> <p>12</p> <p>13</p> <p>14</p> <p>15</p> <p>16</p> <p>17</p> <p>18</p> <p>19</p> <p>20</p> <p>21</p> <p>22</p> <p>23</p> <p>24</p> <p>25</p>	

David Klos - October 27, 2021

A	49:4,5,12,20,21	agent 85:16	80:21 84:14	122:10,22
ability 42:12	50:8,21 51:3	ago 19:6 34:25	97:12 123:11	126:7,12
43:21 78:2 88:8	131:15	36:20 39:21	amounts 28:24	anymore 57:1
88:10	accumulated	43:5 94:20	41:7 122:8	61:22 62:7
able 31:20 32:2	47:22	95:11	analysis 30:9	AP 115:14
above-styled	accurate 27:25	agree 8:11 47:10	53:25 54:6,9,18	apologize 9:21
1:21	85:10	47:11 51:7 77:2	55:1,8 89:13	27:22 63:11
absolutely 12:4	acknowledgment	89:19 134:14	analyst 5:17,25	66:21 77:1
16:10 77:1 80:1	87:21,22	134:24	and/or 40:12	apparatus 12:9
80:14 90:1,4,10	act 11:5	agreement 12:23	67:7 91:22	APPEARANC...
94:1 115:6	activities 107:17	84:11 96:4,8,23	annual 23:22	2:1
accepting 19:17	activity 107:16	97:9 98:5,12	80:9 112:8	appeared 2:5,12
access 99:13	actual 37:5 85:13	104:8,9 109:22	114:7,12 121:3	2:19
128:25	add 118:10	110:7 128:1	125:23 130:22	appears 49:3
account 53:20	additional 89:2	agreements 41:3	130:23 131:3	64:2
60:3 113:16	address 64:7	97:16,23 98:1	131:10	append 117:12
accountant 26:5	addressed 44:9	agrees 48:7	answer 16:23,25	appended 137:16
26:9,15,20	127:24	ahead 45:7	17:2 20:18,20	application 37:8
39:12,17 90:19	adjourned	Aigen 2:18 3:4	21:3,15 22:1	37:9,15,16
109:5 113:23	135:20	95:18,22,23	25:5 28:10	applied 39:17
accountant's	advisor 9:24 71:7	99:8 100:3,10	35:16 41:18	46:8,9 48:11,14
39:13	74:19	100:12,14,24	50:11 53:24	49:5,8 64:13,16
accountants	advisor-type 6:7	101:14 102:4	55:15,23 71:5	65:1 131:15
109:3	advisors 1:10	102:18 103:20	78:11 79:7 87:7	apply 38:24
accounted 38:6	12:14,15,17	104:23 105:24	94:13,14,17,21	131:9
45:8,11 64:23	13:3,6 27:1	106:3 108:11	104:22 128:15	Appreciate
accounting 4:16	52:19 55:1	109:15,20	130:10 132:3,7	100:13
6:5,5,11,11	60:22 65:23	135:12,16,18	132:13,16	appropriate
7:14,17,21 8:23	71:6 72:22 86:6	Akard 1:24 2:4	133:15 134:15	35:19,22
9:3,5,5,9,15,23	99:20 100:17	aleck 50:7	134:20	approval 66:14
10:12 33:22	102:21 103:9	alleged 97:22	answered 21:2	77:19,23 78:3
35:9,16,20	121:13,24	98:5	41:17 56:11	78:21 79:3
43:18 53:4	122:10 124:18	Allocation 70:25	76:19 85:21	126:15
62:10,11 70:15	128:17	74:12 75:6	91:10 92:5,6	approvals 80:9
74:22 84:2	affect 16:11,12	allow 75:4	94:9 125:19,20	approximate 6:1
107:5 109:2,7	16:20	allowed 46:13	answering	63:2
115:1,7,18,21	affiliate 39:23	81:22 82:1	134:12	approximately
117:25 118:4	122:20,25	94:16 96:20	answers 9:18	5:9 105:10
118:16	affiliated 10:21	137:15	16:10,13	April 7:13,22
accrue 49:13	34:8 35:4,11	allowing 96:8	anybody 24:13	11:16,21 88:9
accrued 38:8	36:2 61:15	amortization	60:1 80:16	areas 107:21
46:8,16,20,25	affiliates 38:5	23:16 28:1	111:12,16	argumentative
47:1,4,5,11,14	51:20 121:25	amount 15:5,15	112:13,25	90:15 132:2,5,8
47:18,19,24,25	AFR 86:7	37:5 47:22	113:2 116:22	133:3
48:4,5,7,15	afternoon 95:22	59:13 73:2	119:2,11 120:5	art 8:1 9:3 10:12

David Klos - October 27, 2021

ascertain 45:2,4	54:14	109:23 115:12	117:17	bit 7:9 12:12 14:2
asked 16:18 20:5	attach 128:10	116:16 119:24	began 5:11	30:15 33:12
21:2 30:18	attempt 87:7	121:2 122:3	beginning 109:4	39:3 48:1 98:15
41:10,17 44:10	attention 123:25	123:1,13 124:7	behalf 2:6,13,20	106:23 107:5
54:13 55:17,22	attorney 2:5,12	126:11	12:24 25:2 78:2	Blair 115:10,14
56:11 57:12,15	2:18 137:18	awfully 17:20	78:22 79:1	118:7
59:12 70:9	audit 9:25 24:6		111:13 112:15	board 120:25
76:19 84:8,17	80:4 116:10	B	112:21	121:20,23
85:21 86:10	audit-driven	back 6:14 15:19	beings 71:19	122:4
91:10 92:5 94:9	88:5	22:12 23:21,25	belief 104:16	boards 122:11
108:11 110:18	audited 116:13	36:11 40:18	believe 6:23	bold 40:25
114:3 121:24	116:17,24	49:17 51:13	15:11 16:3 17:3	bonus 14:8,9,10
122:1 129:13	119:8,14,19,25	55:16 65:12	17:8 18:2 19:23	14:19,24 15:14
130:19 131:1,6	auditor 24:3	67:4 68:25	21:13,13 22:20	18:5 90:21
133:1	auditors 24:5	82:23 83:19	23:13,19 24:16	book 33:21 34:12
asking 18:11	88:6,14	84:4 85:12	26:13 49:9 51:1	34:20
20:21 28:6	aughts 106:13	102:13 128:6	51:2 74:16	booked 32:23
38:20 56:9,13	August 42:16	back-end 15:19	77:17 78:1,7,19	33:11 34:9 35:5
61:5,7 77:13	44:13	15:21	81:8 83:1,3	35:20 36:24
83:22 94:15	authenticate 28:5	back-ended	86:25 102:6	44:23 90:8
100:9 125:18	authenticity	14:25	111:10 115:24	116:4,8 118:24
133:10,17,18	67:23	background 4:13	121:11,16,22	books 80:7
134:4	authoritative	53:2 70:5,6,7	122:1 125:14	110:24 111:4
aspect 118:20	65:1,2	backup 36:19	believed 35:10	borrow 78:22
ass 17:18	authority 36:9	bad 20:12 89:15	57:6 113:17	borrower 45:6,15
asserted 97:7	77:3,13,15 78:7	balance 49:6	beneficiaries	45:19,24 46:2
98:8	78:21,25	80:6,8 120:12	17:10,15	130:4,5
asset 15:7	authorization	120:19	benefiting 73:9	borrower/lender
assets 15:3 87:10	108:10	ballpark 85:24	best 5:25 8:3	133:21
87:12 97:12	authorize 77:4	bank 36:17 99:13	52:15,17 55:7	borrowing 120:7
107:12	authorized 40:2	bankruptcy 1:1	63:24 64:4	boss 39:13
assist 42:13	59:15 69:6,25	31:19 80:10	78:16,17 85:8	Boston 4:15 5:8
assistance 31:13	85:24 108:5	96:15 98:12	95:19 109:21	5:10
assistant 6:24 7:4	112:20 113:15	102:14 104:12	110:6 111:9	brain 32:9
7:7,10 8:8	119:4	base 14:5,7	115:4 116:20	Brandon 1:22
assisted 22:23	authorizing	based 14:11,14	116:25 119:9	137:2,25
assume 28:7 29:7	94:20	32:12 37:17	119:16 120:4,9	break 7:6
90:6 95:18	Avenue 2:11,17	46:5,7 48:12,19	120:16,21	bridge 29:22
101:21	aware 35:6 58:24	54:14 104:14	123:20 125:6	30:6
assumed 7:14	59:2,3 80:18,21	104:16 118:12	126:2	briefly 13:5
53:3	96:6,10,12	basically 6:3	better 111:19	bring 49:6
assuming 36:14	97:15 100:24	31:13 56:1 81:5	biggest 123:6	broad 9:22 35:17
36:21 41:23	101:5,8 102:7	basis 23:22 30:2	bill 74:20	61:3 107:21
64:1	103:20,24	133:1	bills 82:4,5,10,11	broader 76:8
assumptions	106:6,20	Bates 83:15	birth 4:9	broken 53:16

David Klos - October 27, 2021

brokers 10:17	88:12,17 93:7	certify 137:3,17	98:3	121:20
brought 6:4,14	93:20,21 107:6	cetera 6:1 14:20	closed-end 74:14	company 81:14
31:3,7 97:15	107:16 109:7	CFO 5:21,25	closely 62:4	122:16,23
bucks 74:25	111:3 129:8,10	8:18 48:6,21	coach 100:11	compel 132:18,20
budgeting 6:8	casual 134:22	131:25	coaching 100:10	compensate 72:8
burn 130:20	caught 62:5	chain 53:5	100:13	72:12 79:14
businesses 30:1	cause 1:21 137:6	chance 69:4	cold 46:6	89:20 110:15
busy 11:15,19	137:20	change 8:8 16:10	collect 81:17	compensated
128:10	caused 79:12	46:10 59:1	collected 81:19	17:16 110:2,3
C	81:10	84:13 103:25	collectible 87:15	compensation
call 6:4 11:11,13	causes 82:9	changed 6:18	collecting 15:16	14:3,6,8,19
38:10 63:14	Central 138:2	39:11 84:16	81:6,6	15:14 16:4,12
90:16 132:21	Cert 138:1	changes 7:1	collection 87:25	16:16,21 17:4,8
called 9:24 58:21	certain 5:17	137:14	collective 52:2	17:24 18:5
59:11 70:24	11:13 12:21,21	Changing 106:23	college 4:15 5:6	60:18 73:8,12
74:16 88:7	13:12 23:14	characterize 54:1	column 36:25	79:25 90:2,12
109:5 112:9	33:13 38:1	76:10 87:18,19	37:7	90:17 105:21
calling 90:24	54:14 67:21	characterized	combination	complete 15:3
Calls 112:3	70:12 83:9	54:2	39:16 45:12	74:23 106:11
capital 1:6,9 5:11	95:11 96:9	charge 6:15 10:3	combine 106:24	completed 15:22
6:6 8:4 13:6	97:10 98:17	chief 7:13,17,21	Combs 1:22	15:25 16:2
23:22,23 26:19	99:14 101:1	8:23,23 9:3	137:2,25	74:21
26:23 27:1 29:4	103:22 106:18	10:12 13:20,22	come 47:12 53:7	completely 15:24
29:19 32:6,23	109:24 111:20	53:3	59:19 65:3,5	27:25 89:9,15
35:3 37:25 71:6	128:8	circumstance	76:22 101:6	90:7 115:17
107:2 110:8	certainly 6:18	51:1	117:9,19	completion
car 82:9	9:17 12:3 20:10	circumstances	comes 133:21	137:12
career 11:20	26:4 30:11	31:2 134:25	comfortable 88:6	complex 108:24
careful 17:21	32:16 34:4	claim 81:1,9	coming 17:20	108:25 109:2
carry 110:24	35:18 37:23,24	claimant 15:16	36:13 118:9	compliance 6:8
case 43:20 86:24	42:11 50:4 58:8	18:6	command 53:5	72:4
89:18 103:11	62:14 69:1	clarification	commencement	comprehend
105:17 124:14	77:13,24 86:22	124:19	112:14 126:19	129:20
130:2	101:8,10,12	clarify 11:3 12:8	comment 17:13	computer 137:11
cash 9:25 23:21	108:8	53:1 66:18	commission	computerized
23:24 25:23,24	certainty 29:13	75:25	138:4	1:24
26:7 31:9,10,12	42:19 68:18	clear 17:21 26:19	common 30:5	concept 89:16
31:14,16,23	69:8,11,24 70:2	27:11 29:14	86:5	concern 23:23
32:8,12,14	102:19 103:10	52:24 63:9	communicated	24:1,2,4 56:21
41:15,24 42:12	103:12 108:7	69:15,16 73:13	95:12	56:23,25 62:17
42:23 43:5,22	121:16	clearly 74:2	communicating	concerning 17:7
43:24 44:1	CERTIFICATE	client 133:7	53:9	63:20
57:25 61:25	137:1	clients 17:25	communication	conclude 80:25
63:2 73:20	Certified 137:2	Cliff 7:23	83:10	concluding 24:6
	137:25	close 17:21 33:14	communications	conclusion 94:25

David Klos - October 27, 2021

112:4,10 condition 96:4 conditional 97:11 conduct 69:18 confer 26:4 confident 69:5 confirm 59:17 61:19 confused 41:6 134:22 confusion 11:6 conjunction 24:5 connection 24:12 26:2 consent 74:16 75:23 80:2 85:15 90:3 93:16 consented 74:17 consequence 104:20 considerations 16:1 60:10 constant 75:15 construct 90:2 consultancy 11:9 11:11 contended 113:10 context 133:16 133:19 134:10 contingent 14:11 continue 17:22 100:8 110:24 continued 111:2 continuously 6:17 29:22 contract 71:10 contracted 71:15 contradict 79:18 control 43:2 90:10 controlled 89:8 controller 6:24 6:25 7:4,4,8,8	7:10,10 8:4,8,9 8:12,15 9:11 10:10,12 12:19 13:10,17 48:6 conversation 18:22 19:9,19 43:15 51:25 70:14 91:25 93:18 94:24 103:18 105:18 111:11,16 conversations 18:23 19:11 20:2 34:11 42:6 51:25 93:19 96:16,19,22,24 97:20,22 98:2,5 102:9,12,13 104:24 105:5,7 105:11,16,21 124:3 conversion 74:15 74:17,21 converted 74:13 conveyed 102:25 103:1 coordinated 22:21 copied 127:10 copy 135:13,16 135:18 corporate 6:5,15 9:9,15 25:22 33:8 35:9,16 39:12,13,16 43:17 61:14 62:11 70:15 73:20 84:2 109:1,6 115:1,7 115:18,20 117:25 118:3 118:16 122:20 122:25 correct 5:22,23 8:19,21 9:20	16:17 40:2 42:1 45:25 51:11 61:10 64:25 68:10 69:2 82:21 88:11,17 88:23 91:2 97:18 99:17 101:21,22 105:23 124:21 125:6 127:16 135:24 corrected 127:19 correctly 5:16 51:13 62:9 cost 97:13 counsel 2:6,13,19 18:10,20,25 20:3 21:16 22:21,25 23:3 96:17,20,22 97:21 98:1 137:17 couple 61:20 87:14 123:2 129:13 course 20:3 33:19 51:9 66:12 69:18 83:22 84:4,6 court 1:1 117:8 courteous 76:24 covered 20:14 53:2 CPA 4:19,22 44:21 48:6,20 49:11 131:25 CPAs 95:4 created 80:10 credit 6:8 25:9 40:11 89:13 90:11 creditors 15:17 CSR 1:23 curiosity 59:21 current 4:25	cut 109:8 cycle 41:7 <hr/> D D 1:22 137:2 D-CNL003763 117:17 Dallas 1:3,25 2:4 2:18 4:12 5:10 138:2 damages 82:12 date 4:9 8:6 24:22 45:20 47:5,6,23 48:25 49:13,13,14 84:14 123:23 125:1 dated 114:23 137:22 dates 27:10 28:18 28:24 111:17 Davenport 138:1 David 1:14,18 4:1,6 136:5 Davor 2:5 76:22 day 29:21 32:1 34:1 59:7 74:8 93:18 117:2 135:25 day-to-day 9:17 62:6 days 59:5 76:2,7 de 127:22 dealing 29:20 128:19 debtor 26:21 32:23 38:6,22 38:23 76:16 77:3,5,8 78:2 81:1 87:14 88:16 116:22 debtor's 111:4 116:13,17 119:8 debts 89:3	December 24:20 24:23 51:10,15 51:22 53:18 54:24 56:17,22 57:6,13,17,21 58:7,9 60:20,25 61:21 63:19 98:18,18,24 99:19 100:15 101:1 102:17 103:23 113:2,3 120:2 124:1,9 decide 38:23 39:5 90:12 decided 24:9,12 24:14,15 32:7 64:22 77:18 84:25 86:1 decides 38:22 deciding 64:15 69:18 decision 27:2 30:25 86:5 decision-making 32:10 decisions 29:8 30:9,16 declare 135:23 deduction 73:9 default 58:13,17 61:14 62:18 defendants 1:11 1:20 2:6,20 96:3,6 defense 80:15 96:3,7,13,23 97:5,7 98:1 defenses 96:10 96:18 defer 103:13,18 define 47:18,20 defined 104:8 134:21 definitely 6:21 7:12 73:6
--	--	--	---	--

David Klos - October 27, 2021

definition 38:11 104:13,14	determining 89:13	31:4,7 39:21 57:18,22 58:3,4	43:7,10,16,25 51:18 52:4,7,19	113:17,24 121:24 124:10
definitive 50:11	Dickman 138:1	60:1,5,8 62:20	53:12,15,16	124:11 125:4
definitively 15:20	differed 54:10	63:1,20 92:14	54:18,24 55:9	125:12,24
degree 4:16	difference 49:7	101:20	55:17,25 56:3	126:4,10,14
degrees 4:14	76:6	discussions 19:3	56:10,15 60:21	135:1
Deloitte 5:8,8	differences	21:8 24:13	61:24 62:23	duly 1:19 4:2
demand 23:13	107:14	30:24 41:13	65:3,24 69:9,12	137:4
86:3,8 87:14	different 30:5	59:22 63:22	70:15 74:3 76:1	duties 9:12 62:6
88:15 127:14	34:15 38:21	103:2	76:13 77:2,25	126:21
128:2,23	44:11 74:9	disinterested	85:1,19 89:18	duty 25:9
demanded 129:4	77:12 99:11	137:8	90:9 91:14,17	
deny 67:22	107:11,12,17	dissimilar 14:21	91:21 92:9,14	<hr/> E <hr/>
department 9:7	125:19,20	dissuade 62:23	92:23 93:3,10	earlier 17:13
84:9	128:18 132:4	distinct 10:10	93:25 94:2,5	49:14 75:13
depend 15:15	direct 9:15 20:17	distribution 59:9	95:1,24 98:11	98:16 101:6
17:6,9 134:11	20:19 34:13	83:5	98:11 101:7	111:13 123:3
depending 31:2	78:13 132:3	DISTRICT 1:2	104:24 105:16	earliest 128:1
32:15 89:11	directed 20:22	dividend 105:8	105:21 112:20	early 51:22 54:24
depends 16:5	51:19 60:21	DIVISION 1:3	113:8,14 116:6	60:20 87:1 89:2
134:10	68:19,20,21	document 44:21	116:21 121:12	111:5,21 135:7
deponent 137:14	69:1,3 125:23	46:23 50:15	122:9 124:8	educational 4:13
deposition 1:13	directing 132:7	64:6,12 76:23	125:10,22	effect 41:14
1:18 18:9,24	132:15	76:23 79:17	126:16	62:18,21
19:16,22,24	direction 33:2	84:10 88:2	Dondero's 62:11	129:23
20:5,9,14,16	34:2 35:23	96:15 117:5	73:6 76:9 77:19	effective 125:1
21:1,7,9,12,19	54:15 55:18	documents 67:8	78:3,21 79:3,11	effectively 49:22
27:20 132:17	62:24 65:1,2	76:20	79:18	75:5
135:20 137:4,7	94:25 102:23	doing 6:5,11 9:24	double 81:5	effectuate 99:13
137:12,19	102:24 137:11	25:18 85:14	doubt 35:21 36:8	112:21 126:14
describe 8:2	directions 103:19	86:17 89:13	dozens 65:16	effectuated 99:3
54:11,13	directly 103:19	95:2	draft 24:16	eight 117:13
described 13:16	disagree 89:19	dollar 28:18 75:2	drafted 22:21	either 21:18 26:3
54:10 69:6 72:1	99:21 100:18	75:2	drafting 58:17	26:25 29:12
87:23,24 92:2	disciplinary 5:3	dollar-for-dollar	DRIP 105:8	30:16 31:10,16
109:24 110:13	disciplined 5:2	73:4	driven 42:19	35:23,25 38:8
114:11	discuss 20:4 97:2	dollars 18:1	drukavina@m...	39:12 48:19
describes 119:4	discussed 15:8	123:9	2:7	50:12 68:14
describing 33:7	21:16 90:1	Dondero 2:20	due 25:16,19	69:1,3,9 79:24
detail 54:5 58:2	93:15,17 94:1	24:11 29:15	37:12,18 47:12	84:21 86:12
determination	97:4,6	30:8,19 32:7	49:12 51:10,14	105:25 125:22
60:17	discussing 42:3	33:21 34:2,7,18	74:20 76:22	137:18
determine 38:16	65:9 77:25 92:4	38:4 39:24	98:18,24 111:1	electronically
determined	92:8,11 93:3,10	40:10 41:14	111:7 112:1,6	84:22
40:21	discussion 19:21	42:3,7,10 43:2	112:16 113:11	eliminate 111:14

David Klos - October 27, 2021

email 2:7,14,22 54:16 59:8,9 67:14,15,18,21 69:4,7 70:13,16 82:23,25 83:7 83:10,11 114:23 115:2,5 115:13,18,23 117:7,15,16,18 117:22,24 118:4,6,12,20 119:5 127:5,7 127:10,12 128:11,20 138:3 emailed 59:11 emails 80:13 employed 122:18 employee 12:23 26:17,21,24 123:22 employees 43:11 72:2 98:8 106:7 106:12 107:8 107:20 123:16 employment 78:13 ended 120:1 ensure 23:20 enter 78:25 entered 98:11 enterprise 30:1 32:18 entire 12:9 115:17,20 entities 6:7 25:24 26:16 30:6 31:11,16 34:8 61:15 65:18,22 65:22,24 99:6 101:1 102:20 103:8 106:24 107:18,25 108:17,19,21 108:25 121:18	entitled 17:23 18:10 20:4 entity 12:20 13:8 13:11,13 30:20 31:20 32:7,15 32:17 34:19 35:4,11 36:2 40:10 42:10 75:8,10 90:10 109:13 131:25 equal 86:6 130:22 equity 79:24 90:22 error 70:25 71:2 71:19,25 72:13 72:14,19 73:4 79:15 80:20 81:1,14 85:22 89:20 90:3,3 92:11,16,17,18 errors 71:9 72:20 72:21 73:16 especially 15:4 established 51:4 75:13 76:11,12 78:12 estate 107:13 estimate 11:22 et 6:1 14:20 event 116:17 119:10,13 120:1,7 135:6 137:19 events 16:20 96:9 eventually 32:2 evidence 80:14 111:5,9 116:20 116:25 119:9 119:16 120:4,9 120:16,21 evolved 6:18,21 exact 7:5,11 15:24 20:16 94:19	exactly 5:18 14:24 15:23 34:3 48:2 77:23 80:16 Examination 3:3 3:4,5,6 4:3 95:21 109:18 127:1 example 31:6,9 37:6 48:25 exceeded 87:10 123:12 exception 16:8 17:1 44:2,3 excess 41:15 exchange 128:12 exclude 18:22 exclusively 23:13 33:14,14 excruciatingly 73:13 excuse 37:1 74:25 executed 24:18 31:1 70:22 84:3 124:24 execution 22:7,13 22:20 24:23 83:21 84:19 85:6 executive 26:14 exhibit 22:4 23:8 27:9,15,23 36:12 40:20 42:17 44:13,22 46:12 48:12 49:1,10 64:2,5 67:17 68:4 82:24 83:20 114:1,22 127:2 129:12 exhibits 3:10 67:2,7 68:1 existing 7:13 23:13 expand 59:7	expect 17:12 64:12 65:4 83:12 86:21 expectation 15:1 expected 126:13 expenses 73:7 experience 5:5 37:18 38:14 46:19 49:11 104:16 130:2 expert 82:21 87:6 expertise 48:20 expires 138:4 explain 8:22 64:13 107:1 explaining 92:25 explore 12:12 express 14:19 Expressway 138:2 extended 7:12 extending 14:17 extent 31:10,12 60:24 61:8 66:10 86:23 135:7 extrapolating 92:24 <hr/> F <hr/> FA 88:7 face 71:16 facile 15:24 facilitate 25:18 31:15 facility 6:8 fact 29:6 58:23 58:23 76:14 79:21 94:23 101:9 112:19 128:20 failed 58:18 failure 126:20 fair 16:15 35:8 60:9 65:15	91:16 97:14,23 99:1,15 104:17 105:15,20 115:16 123:20 fairly 9:22 30:4,5 84:7 fall 80:10 121:20 familiar 21:23 22:5,6 28:1 67:1 82:15 104:1 114:17 116:13 119:21 far 5:1 24:15 37:5 58:23 62:6 84:11 87:9 fault 81:10 faulty 43:3 February 80:19 113:10 126:8 126:12 fee 74:16,18 75:23 80:2 85:15 90:3 93:16 feel 54:5 69:5 feels 35:17 82:22 fight 53:17 file 80:11 final 30:9 financial 8:23 13:20,22 87:20 116:14,17,24 119:8,14,19,22 119:25 financials 122:1 122:4,7 find 26:13 31:15 67:14 129:17 fine 21:10 39:3 90:21 106:25 FINRA 4:21 firm 95:23 first 4:2 37:2,4 42:22 46:14 48:14 49:5 50:7
---	--	--	--	--

David Klos - October 27, 2021

72:14,19,19 75:14 96:2 110:20 131:15 five 105:3 126:25 flag 10:4 flavoring 63:14 flight 132:10 flip 37:1 flipped 9:20 Floor 1:25 2:11 flow 23:21,25 26:7 88:17 96:15 focus 8:14 65:10 focused 6:7 follow 16:18 follow-up 128:17 followed 116:11 follows 4:2 forecast 126:3 129:10 forecasting 6:8 forecasts 9:24 44:1,4 126:3 129:9 foregoing 135:24 137:4 foreign 89:15 forgave 123:15 forget 86:7 forgetting 9:8 forgive 123:22 forgiven 96:8 106:7,16,17,20 122:19,24 123:11,11 forgiveness 97:10 97:17 122:14 forgiving 123:7 form 6:16 8:25 11:17,24 12:25 14:12 21:24 22:8,15 23:10 25:3,11 27:4 29:10 32:25	33:24 34:21 35:13 36:4 37:20 38:17,25 39:7 40:3,14 42:24 43:19 44:16,24 45:9 45:17 46:21 47:8,15 48:8,22 49:15 50:13 51:5 52:21 53:22 54:7 55:3 55:12,19 57:8 60:12 61:1 63:5 64:9 65:19,25 66:7,15 69:20 71:3,12,20 76:18 77:6,20 77:23 78:4,23 79:5,19 81:2,11 81:23 82:6,13 84:11,12 87:3 88:18 89:5 90:14 91:3,9 93:13 94:8 95:5 99:4,23 100:19 101:3,25 102:15 103:15 104:18 108:2 128:13 130:7 130:16 131:11 131:21 133:13 133:22 134:8 134:17 135:2 found 61:18 foundation 113:20 125:17 four 6:13 128:23 frame 4:24 7:11 7:12 8:10,14,24 12:6 20:12 24:8 25:1 66:12,20 67:16 106:13 123:18 Frank 8:17 11:1 20:9 29:13	30:15,17 35:23 35:25 36:10 44:7 52:1 53:7 53:8 54:15 55:9 60:20 61:14 68:14,14 69:1,3 70:13,14 77:13 77:15 80:12,13 93:6 101:7,18 101:23 102:3,4 102:8,9,11 121:22 127:19 Frank's 39:18 Frankly 48:10 fraud 81:5 frequent 84:1 Friday 118:1 front 10:17 44:8 67:20 68:5 72:3 full 57:3 106:18 full-service 107:5 full-time 12:3 function 72:2 fund 1:9 6:11,11 9:5,5 13:6 70:24,25 71:1,6 71:7,8 72:8 73:15 74:11,12 74:13,13,14,17 75:2,6 80:20,23 81:16 86:5 109:3 funds 10:21,22 12:13 29:9 30:2 30:19 31:20 34:8 35:11 75:24,24 76:1 80:9 85:14 128:19 further 3:6 24:19 84:18 126:24 127:1 135:10 137:17 future 17:4 45:16 49:13,20 53:17	93:7 <hr/> G <hr/> gearing 53:17 gears 65:8 general 18:13,15 19:9,10 20:11 20:13 32:20 33:19 61:4 92:11 93:4 96:24 97:6 104:4,5 108:20 133:24 134:6 135:4 generally 19:25 27:24 30:4 32:21 38:4,4 40:2,11,16 42:15 45:8 77:22 96:5,10 96:12,17 98:20 105:1 107:1 108:18 110:22 116:15 119:21 generallys 40:6 generating 42:12 Germans 63:14 getting 10:4 23:24 44:8 51:13 59:8 give 5:21,24 14:4 16:13 39:3 67:25 given 15:5 43:2 43:22 47:23 70:12 73:21,22 74:1 102:8 123:3 129:2 global 52:25 70:24 74:12 75:6 101:13 go 15:19 16:1 20:1 43:6 54:4 65:12 81:9 82:18 85:10	105:24 127:2 134:4 goes 28:9 40:18 87:9 going 14:2 15:5,6 16:9,12,15,19 17:5 20:19 28:17 32:10 36:11,12 42:22 46:11 49:13 55:16 57:11,14 62:18 65:8,9,10 65:12 68:1 70:5 74:22 79:9 82:23 83:11,19 88:7 89:20 106:23 107:17 108:20 111:17 117:5 118:13 127:6 129:12 132:4,13 134:11 good 73:20 95:22 96:1 100:12 grad 5:7 graduate 4:14,15 group 5:19 6:11 6:16 9:9,14,15 9:21 10:7,9,14 10:15,24 11:7 35:9 43:18 61:21 62:10,11 83:5 109:3 110:24 115:2,5 115:18,21 117:25 118:16 126:8 groups 6:19,20 guess 8:8 88:24 104:21 <hr/> H <hr/> half 5:9 94:20 95:11 110:20 half-million
---	--	--	---	--

David Klos - October 27, 2021

123:9	121:7 127:13	held 6:16 10:20	41:2,2,12,16,24	28:5 30:10,11
hand 90:9	127:17 128:1	121:10,12	42:5,20,22 43:6	33:13 68:18
handled 11:9	128:23	122:20,25	43:7,9,10,12,16	69:5,11 92:3
26:21 35:9 40:8	HCMFA's 70:23	hell 74:24	44:5 49:11	102:19 106:18
handles 11:7	119:25	help 33:2 65:22	50:19 51:2,4,19	hundreds 65:16
hands 57:2	HCMLP 10:21	66:20 67:16	51:20 58:13,21	
happened 35:25	29:4 42:20 60:2	100:4	59:9 64:24	I
47:13 59:2,4	68:8 71:17 72:2	helped 105:9	65:18,21 70:24	idea 7:24 57:10
93:8,11	72:2,23 76:2	helping 31:14	71:6,11 72:7,10	89:12 108:13
happening 27:14	80:1 94:1 104:8	Hendrix 9:16	74:12,25 75:8	identified 72:25
happens 47:13	109:24 110:3,4	18:16,19,24	75:10,12,14,23	illiquid 11:13
happy 55:22	110:12,15,16	20:3 27:19	75:24,25 76:4,5	important 44:6,7
hard 15:4 18:1	113:15 115:8	39:13 52:11	76:12 79:8,25	59:18,20 93:22
26:13 47:20	118:8,13	84:17 99:2,18	80:2,7 81:18	importantly
63:7 71:5	121:25 122:8	100:14,25	84:9 88:14 89:1	85:15
134:12	125:11,23	103:3,14	89:4,12 90:4,5	impossible 80:24
harder 11:13	126:20 128:1	117:25 124:4	90:22 92:19,22	91:25
HARDT 2:3	HCMS 2:20	hereof 48:16	93:23 97:11	impression 52:24
HARR 2:3	95:24 98:23	hereon 48:15	104:11 105:22	in-house 23:3
hat 43:15	99:8,10 107:3,4	hereto 137:16	106:6 107:2,24	inappropriate
hate 57:1 97:4	107:5 109:21	hesitate 64:17	109:22 110:8	81:20
Hayley 83:21	109:25 110:3	hesitating 106:16	112:20 119:12	inartful 77:16
118:10	124:22	hey 42:23 85:9	122:19,19,23	incidental 128:21
HCM 76:16	HCRE 2:20	hierarchy 10:25	123:7,14,21	include 52:18
HCMFA 13:6	95:24 98:23	high 105:5	125:4 126:14	107:25
53:20 65:10	99:8,10,21	Highland 1:6,9	Highland's 42:13	included 85:12
68:8 71:10,17	100:17 107:3	5:11,12,14,22	51:9 72:13,14	115:5 116:16
72:8,8,12,12,24	107:11,20	6:6 7:25 8:4,12	history 62:2	116:23 118:3
73:3,5,7,14,17	108:6,12,22	8:16 10:14,18	116:3,7 118:22	119:8,13,25
73:21 74:10,24	110:6,7,10,12	10:20 11:23	119:2,12 120:5	120:7,12,19
75:1,1,21 76:11	110:15 124:20	12:6,8,9,23	120:17	122:5,7 126:3
76:16,17 78:14	he'll 94:14	13:4,5,14,17,18	hit 82:3	including 79:14
78:22 79:1,13	head 62:15	13:21 14:3,22	hits 82:9	115:17
79:14 80:2,20	107:10	15:2,15 16:5,6	HMS 99:21	inconsequential
80:22,25 81:15	headers 36:25	17:5,6 23:2,21	100:17	127:23
85:16 87:2,5,9	hear 52:4 113:8	23:21,22,23	hold 4:18 121:15	incorrect 55:5,6
87:15 88:10	heard 30:17	25:2 26:17,18	honestly 58:22	55:11
89:2,3,12,13,20	62:16 74:3	26:19,23,25	hope 43:20 82:7	INDEX 3:1
90:17,21,23	91:14,17,21	28:2 29:4,18,20	hopelessly 53:16	indicate 44:22
91:23 92:19,20	122:22 125:18	29:24 31:12,17	Houlihan 71:23	80:7,16
93:16,21,23	hearing 101:10	32:6,23 33:3,4	hours 11:22 12:6	indicates 135:5
110:2 115:8	hearsay 79:17	33:7 34:7,19	12:7,10	individual 31:8
118:8,13,14	heavy 107:13	35:3,4,10 36:2	housed 72:2	52:2 72:24
119:18 120:6	hedge 6:11 30:15	36:24 37:10	human 71:19	individuals
120:11,18,24	33:12	39:22 40:22	hundred 23:14	106:19 123:3

David Klos - October 27, 2021

inflow 59:8	103:22	105:17 108:1	100:10	99:12 100:8
info@dickman...	insulting 132:5	113:12 124:13	keeper 26:15	101:10 102:25
138:3	133:6,9	issued 124:16	keeping 129:1	104:13,13,20
informal 83:25	insurance 80:20	issues 75:15	kind 10:25 14:23	105:12 106:11
105:14	80:22 81:5,6,9	79:23 121:6	15:25 52:12	106:14 108:7,8
informally 62:5	81:14,19 82:4		89:7 99:13	110:2,3 112:23
information	82:10,19	J	106:12 108:22	117:11 119:7
59:16 129:1	intended 44:15	Jack 106:15	108:23 109:8	119:18 120:11
informed 62:10	44:19 111:6	January 29:16	Klos 1:14,18 4:1	121:12,23
102:3	130:3	42:16 44:13	4:6 61:24 64:22	123:17 127:23
inject 90:22	intent 95:12	58:11,15,25	95:22 109:19	129:6 130:10
ink 84:23	interco 68:8	59:23 60:2,23	117:21 136:5	130:18 131:23
insinuation 16:9	115:22	61:7,18 112:22	knew 70:6,11	knowing 102:23
17:1	intercompany	113:3,16	85:22 128:23	knowledge 7:24
insolvent 87:2,6	32:22 41:3	Jim 2:20 24:11	129:3	13:8,10 24:13
installment	65:17 68:9,11	26:4,4 29:13,14	know 4:19 5:1	34:6 35:1 44:14
110:25 111:7	68:12 69:10	30:17 31:9 34:2	9:22,23 10:19	48:20 49:10
112:1,8,16	interest 37:4,8,13	34:6 35:23 36:1	11:11 12:7,19	60:25 61:16
113:4 114:7,12	37:15 38:9	36:9 44:8 53:16	15:6,13 17:10	63:24 64:5 67:6
125:12,23	40:12 45:12	68:14,18 69:1,3	18:7,8,11 19:10	73:1 79:17
126:4 131:3,10	46:8,8,16,20,25	70:15 80:5 89:9	20:4 23:7,17	98:10 100:6,9
installments	47:1,4,4,11,12	93:25 94:2 97:9	24:1,7,9,12,15	104:10 109:21
14:22 130:23	47:13,14,18,19	101:18 105:22	25:5,7 28:21,23	110:7 112:23
instance 1:20	47:20,21,24,25	108:20,21,23	29:6 31:11,13	121:19 122:10
31:20 34:11,16	48:4,5,7,15	118:9 121:22	31:23,25 32:3,7	123:10,21
34:18 35:25	49:4,6,12,12,20	Jim's 26:15,16,20	35:15 37:25	125:10
39:22 42:22	49:23 50:9,21	26:22,24 36:7	38:11,12,19	known 61:9
68:24 86:22	51:3 86:2 111:3	90:7 93:6 94:19	39:9 40:20	69:23 70:1
instances 32:5	131:15	108:21	43:16,21 44:18	KOPF 2:3
65:16 71:8 91:5	interested 83:13	jmorris@pszjl...	45:4 48:10	Kristin 9:16
institutional 9:5	137:19	2:14	51:16,25 53:1	18:16 39:13,17
instruct 115:7	internal 22:21,25	John 2:12 36:16	53:17,25 54:20	52:1 53:7,8
instructed	internally 96:16	joined 5:14 29:24	54:20 55:14	59:11 61:13
125:11	investment 74:19	122:23	60:14,19,22	62:4,15,15 83:1
instructing 85:9	investments	JONES 2:10	62:13 70:10	83:2,20 99:14
133:2	107:16	judge 132:21	73:17 76:14	101:7,24 102:3
instruction 52:25	investors 74:17	juggled 31:24	77:23 78:20	102:5,8,10,11
61:13,24 62:12	75:5	July 29:17 58:24	81:4,21,25 82:2	108:5,8,12,14
62:17 99:19	involved 10:7	jumble 48:1	82:4,8,19 83:11	109:10 117:25
101:6,13,17,23	25:14,24 60:17	June 11:21 45:23	84:6,25 85:17	118:15 119:3
102:3,5,8,20	iota 16:13	45:24 49:2	85:18,20 86:1,4	Kristin's 100:6
103:7 124:7	irrespective		87:6,17 90:18	100:22 118:20
125:15	90:11	K	90:19,25 91:5	
instructions	issue 29:18 36:20	K-l-o-s 4:7,8	91:13,16 93:19	L
100:15 103:14	43:7,8,17 93:10	keep 27:21	96:14 98:21	L.P 1:6,10

David Klos - October 27, 2021

lacks 113:19 125:17	level 23:20,24 36:6 82:15	68:16,21 69:10 69:15,17,19,24	looked 111:20	25:23
land 132:21	88:14 105:5	70:2,10 73:14	looking 22:3 44:1 117:17	March 5:12,14 6:3 13:24 37:6
language 74:25	liabilities 87:10	74:2,4,7 76:15	looks 27:25 39:6	80:19 122:17
large 55:2 59:8 59:13 93:20	87:12 122:8	76:21 78:3	loop 53:9	marching 52:3
131:25	liability 120:12 120:19	79:13,24 85:18	lost 41:21 63:16	marked 3:10
larger 41:7 58:3	liaison 10:15 11:5	85:20 89:21	lot 100:1 129:20	Master's 4:16
largest 123:8	liberally 12:8	90:10,13 91:2,6	loud 118:6	material 15:7
late 106:13	license 4:20,22	92:3,15 95:4	LP 6:6 8:5 12:14 12:15,17 13:6	matter 109:11,12
launching 10:3	licenses 4:18	107:25 110:19	23:22 26:19,24	matters 26:22,24
Lauren 23:2	life 131:18,19	115:22 116:4,8	29:5 110:8	maturity 131:20
law 2:5,12,19 81:22 82:1,9,16	limited 104:7	116:16,23	lying 79:16	MBA 4:17 131:25
82:22 95:23	lines 5:18	117:3 118:8,10	<hr/> M <hr/>	mean 9:18 15:21 24:10 26:9,11
Lawler 106:17	linked 92:15,17	118:11,13,17	machine 1:24	104:6 114:18
Lawn 2:17	liquidity 29:4,5 29:18,20,23	118:25 119:4,7	magnitude 92:12	meaning 51:4 68:9
lawsuit 112:14	30:7,21 31:21	119:14 122:14	maintained 28:2	means 47:4,12 48:21 63:12
lawsuits 97:15	31:25 32:6,22	123:6,10,14,22	maker 46:15,23 47:1 50:8	84:7 132:1 133:12,20
lawyer 23:4 82:21	33:9 34:20	loaning 72:7,11 89:1 92:19,22	114:12 122:20	134:7 135:7
leading 65:17	35:19 36:2 40:7	loans 32:4 33:14 36:9 40:8 65:17	122:25 129:18	meant 50:12
learn 30:25 51:21 51:23 58:6,6	42:13,20 43:7,8	66:3,5 80:7	129:24	medical 82:3,10 82:10
learned 61:6	43:17 73:2,14	84:1 85:10	makers 126:13 126:19	meet 31:14 33:8 73:2
learning 58:20	73:18 74:10	89:10 90:8	making 71:8 75:18,19 85:12	meeting 52:12 57:25
left 7:14,20 46:8 46:9 109:20	75:1,15,22	91:12,14,23	99:20 100:16	meetings 25:24 43:5,24 62:1,3
legal 18:10,20 84:9 112:3,10	list 59:10 106:12 109:9	94:1,7,22 95:2	107:20,23,25	63:2,19
130:9	litigation 15:5 16:6,11 18:1,25	98:17,22	108:9 126:9	Melissa 26:10,12 108:14,17,18
legally 82:19 84:10	19:21 126:19	105:16 106:6	132:20	109:1,5,9
length 19:24 124:2	litigations 17:7	106:19 107:25	man 17:23 128:10 130:20	member 62:14
let's 8:14 12:12 18:22 21:21	little 9:2 12:12 14:2 30:15	108:1 119:24	manage 32:2	members 10:17
24:19 27:7 28:6	33:12 39:3 48:1	120:8,12,19	managed 10:21 10:21 70:24	memory 27:8 28:17,19 42:16
61:7 66:19	98:15 106:23 107:5	123:2	Management 1:6 1:9 5:12 6:6 8:5	42:18 50:23
68:24 81:17	live 4:11,12	logically 42:15 69:18	13:6 23:22,24	68:15 71:18
103:25 109:19	LLP 2:17	Lokey 71:24	26:19,23 27:1	85:8 87:13
122:14 123:25	loaded 16:22	long 15:8 16:5 17:5,9 34:25	29:4,19 32:6,24	91:20 92:4,7
letter 14:15,17 58:13,17	loan 9:6 28:1 33:11,21 34:9	look 15:19 27:15 38:15 39:4	35:3 71:6 107:2 110:8	93:9,12
letters 80:5	34:13,20 35:12 36:1 39:25 40:1	66:19 114:15	manager 7:2,3	
	41:9 68:11,13	117:10,22	managing 9:25	
		134:3,15,19		

David Klos - October 27, 2021

mental 48:1	minutes 39:21	45:9,17 46:21	mouth 36:7	negative 37:7
mention 10:6	105:25 126:25	47:8,15 48:8,22	Move 120:15	44:4
114:7	misconstrued	49:15 50:2,13	125:16	negotiation 22:7
mentioned 12:13	134:23	51:5 52:21	moved 6:10	22:13,18
61:20 88:13	missed 60:25	53:22 54:7 55:3	muddy 43:14	neither 93:23
98:7 107:23	missing 107:10	55:12,19 56:11	MUNSCH 2:3	never 18:2 56:25
108:4 110:6	mistake 80:12	57:8,19 60:12	mutual 74:13,14	72:25 74:3
116:10	126:8 127:21	61:1 63:5,13		78:12 80:13
met 31:9,25	127:23 128:4,7	64:9 65:19,25	N	91:14 105:15
Michael 2:18	MLP 59:9	66:7,15,24	name 4:4 26:11	105:18,20
95:16,23	moment 32:12	67:17 69:20	26:14 39:10	new 2:11 7:16
135:11	67:16 73:21,22	71:3,12,20	87:21 95:23	26:11,13 68:8
michael.aigen...	116:6 122:15	76:18,22 77:6	names 106:14	68:11 85:10
2:22	monetization	77:20 78:4,23	Nancy 104:24	115:22 118:8
mid 112:21	15:2	79:5,19 81:2,11	105:16,21	132:21
middle 6:10 80:4	monetizing 97:12	81:23 82:6,13	nature 10:1 70:4	NexBank 124:16
108:22	money 15:17	83:13,17 85:21	70:6,7,11 84:1	NexPoint 10:4
million 18:1	33:3,3,7 34:19	87:3 88:18 89:5	NAV 70:25 71:2	12:13,14,14,17
21:22 28:13,14	39:22 41:12,16	90:14 91:3,9,19	71:8,19,25	12:24 13:3,16
28:14 45:25	42:4 45:20	92:5 93:13 94:8	72:19,20,21	21:21 26:3 27:1
46:3 49:1,8	59:13,19 70:4	94:13,16 95:5	73:4,15 79:14	27:12 36:22
58:25 68:7 69:2	72:11,12 73:5	95:16,20 99:4	80:20 81:1,14	37:11,19 40:22
70:7,19,23 72:7	75:12 76:11,12	99:23 100:5,11	85:22 89:20	41:3,15,15 42:4
73:18,25,25	76:13 79:24	100:19 101:3	90:2,3 92:11,16	42:9,11,17,22
74:7,8,24 75:4	92:19,22	101:25 102:15	92:17,18 104:2	43:11,13 53:19
75:9,22,23 76:3	113:24 120:8	103:15 104:18	104:10	56:21 57:6,10
76:19 77:4,10	month 11:22 12:6	108:2 109:19	necessarily 31:25	57:14,18,23
77:11,18,18	months 6:13 19:6	111:11 112:7	50:11 53:4	58:17,25 59:12
78:3,10,22	59:5 75:14	112:13 113:22	69:12 107:14	59:24 62:18
79:12,22 80:2	morning 36:16	116:21 117:2,9	need 29:18 31:16	63:3,20 64:8
80:19 81:18	Morris 2:12 3:5	117:13,16,21	33:12 37:3	65:9 72:22,24
82:25 85:4,18	8:25 11:17,24	119:11,18	41:24 54:5	75:17,19 78:13
85:20,23 86:13	12:25 14:12	120:5,11,17,23	58:14 73:3 93:7	110:19 111:14
89:2 90:17,20	17:20,25 20:17	125:18,21	93:20,21	111:22,25
90:22,24 91:22	20:21,24 21:2,8	126:24 128:13	106:25 107:4	112:15 113:3
91:22 92:8,15	21:24 22:8,15	129:12 130:7	needed 30:3	113:10,15
93:3 115:8	23:10 25:3,11	130:16,19	31:10,12 32:6	120:24 124:18
116:3,23 118:8	27:4,16 29:10	131:1,5,11,21	35:19 41:12	NexPoint's
118:9,13,24	32:25 33:24	132:2,8,11,15	73:5,17 74:10	110:25 111:6
119:7,14,25	34:21 35:13	132:19,23	74:25 75:21	112:21
122:5	36:4,18 37:20	133:3,5,13,22	76:11	night 36:17
mind 36:8 56:20	38:17,25 39:7	134:8,17 135:2	needing 29:5,22	nomenclature
76:9 100:2	40:3,14 41:17	135:10,13,15	needs 29:4 31:14	83:24
mine 24:1	41:20 42:24	135:19	33:9 34:20 40:7	nominal 62:1
minimus 127:22	43:19 44:16,24	motion 132:18,20	42:20 44:9	nonstop 44:5

David Klos - October 27, 2021

North 1:24 2:3 138:2 NORTHERN 1:2 note 21:22,23 22:2,5,7,14,22 23:9,15 24:10 24:18,21,23 25:2,9,17 27:2 27:9,13,14 33:17 38:15 39:4 40:11,13 40:17 46:12,16 46:25 48:5,14 49:10 50:25 51:10 57:18,23 58:4,20 59:12 60:7 63:4,21 64:8 65:9 66:6 66:10,13 70:22 75:18,20 76:7 79:1,22 82:25 83:21 84:3,9,16 84:16,18,19 85:4 86:2,3,3,8 86:13 89:15 92:15 111:22 112:9,12 113:16 122:19 122:24 127:13 127:14,17 128:16 130:3 131:18,20 133:12 134:3,4 134:11,15,20 notes 16:7 17:7 19:25 23:13,14 26:3 36:19 40:21 50:19 52:18 65:10 66:20 67:12 76:1 84:14,22 85:2 86:12 87:14,24 88:7 88:10,15,16 96:8 97:11,16	114:21 122:5 122:12 124:10 124:11,13,24 125:4,7,8,13,25 126:10,13,20 127:17 128:23 129:7 130:12 130:15 Notwithstanding 110:23 111:25 November 54:4 63:18 124:8 137:22 number 12:2,10 14:10 22:4 23:19 27:16 28:9 75:3,4 numbered 1:21 27:19 numbers 14:4,19 28:6 44:4 81:18 nutshell 54:12 NY 2:11 <hr/> O <hr/> o0o-- 1:4 Oak 2:17 oath 97:6 106:4 object 50:2 100:8 objected 118:20 objection 8:25 11:17,24 12:25 14:12 20:17 21:2,24 22:8,15 23:10 25:3,11 27:4 29:10 32:25 33:24 34:21 35:13 36:4 37:20 38:17,25 39:2,7 40:3,14 41:17 42:24 43:19 44:16,24 45:9 45:17 46:21 47:8,15 48:8,22	49:15 50:13 51:5 52:21 53:22 54:7 55:3 55:12,19 56:11 57:8 60:12 61:1 63:5 64:9 65:19 65:25 66:7,15 69:20 71:3,12 71:20 76:18 77:6,20 78:4,23 79:5,19 81:2,11 81:23 82:6,13 85:21 87:3 88:18 89:5 90:14 91:3,9,19 92:5 93:13 94:8 95:5 99:4,23 100:19 101:3 101:25 102:15 103:15 104:18 108:2 111:9 112:3,10 113:19 116:20 116:25 119:9 119:16 120:4,9 120:15,21 125:16 128:13 130:7,16 131:5 131:11,21 132:2 133:13 133:22 134:8 134:17 135:2 obligated 122:12 obligation 25:25 80:1 110:25 111:6,14 112:16 113:11 113:17 114:12 obligations 45:21 121:24 obligor's 33:8 obviously 85:18 occur 55:8 96:9 occurred 47:5 61:17 70:25	72:20,25 85:13 92:13 112:24 October 1:15,21 31:18 80:11 120:24 127:11 128:22 129:3 offended 17:22 offer 14:15,17 offhand 84:16 office 5:10,10 10:17 72:4 121:10 officer 7:14,17,22 8:23,24 9:3 10:13 13:21,22 53:4 121:6,13 123:22 officer-level 7:25 13:18 officers 105:22 106:7 121:18 123:15 official 12:16 13:7 oftentimes 32:3 Oh 100:12 okay 18:14 20:8 51:8,16 52:10 65:13 74:1,7 76:25 81:21 82:23 84:4 93:9 100:3 110:18 110:23 112:25 117:2 119:11 120:23 124:7 125:8 126:2 132:19 old 106:22 one-page 84:11 o0o-- 135:22 open-end 74:13 open-ended 25:6 operate 29:5 operations 9:6 107:19	opinion 44:6 opposed 40:22 42:9 75:8,10 85:1 86:3 89:20 90:12 102:20 103:8 127:17 oral 96:4,7,23 97:8,15,22 98:1 98:5,12 order 27:21 124:9 orders 52:3 ordinary 128:11 organization 72:4 original 27:12 originated 43:9 ought 62:23 outlook 44:2 outside 11:9 128:11 outstanding 38:8 45:22 46:9,10 47:1,19 49:5 125:3 129:2 overall 10:10 30:6 overpayments 53:19 55:2 oversaw 9:17 overseeing 9:14 9:14,21 oversight 6:20 9:4,8 oversimplify 32:11 owed 94:1 owes 45:19 owing 113:24 121:25 <hr/> P <hr/> P 37:25 P.M 1:22,22 135:21
--	---	--	--	---

David Klos - October 27, 2021

PACHULSKI 2:10 package 83:18 page 3:2 28:8 37:2,2 114:15 130:1 pages 20:16,25 117:13 paid 14:11,20 76:3,4,6 80:19 80:22 81:16 85:16 135:7 paper 85:10 118:11 119:4 papered 33:16 66:6 68:21 papering 84:19 85:5 118:17 paragraph 50:8 114:4,7,10,11 114:16,17 129:15 pardon 46:14 parentheses 118:9 part 13:14 17:4 25:22,23 30:23 46:15,24 58:2 61:21 62:6 70:3 70:9,10,11 73:19 75:17,19 76:8 83:17 103:17 106:8 106:17,20 117:13 121:2 122:2,24 123:15 126:20 participated 30:12 121:19 participating 61:25 62:3 particle 63:15 particular 20:22 28:13 29:18 31:6 46:12	61:23 68:16 119:5 particularly 35:22 71:23 parties 71:23 137:18,21 Partners 2:21 99:9 partnership 104:8 parts 72:4 party 71:7 102:22 pass 95:15 135:9 passing 98:7 pattern 66:12 109:11 pause 7:7,16 63:13 pay 47:1 49:14 49:24 74:25 82:5 88:8,10,12 90:20 103:22 103:22 112:16 113:23 122:12 payable 14:23 74:18 93:16 125:4 paygrade 60:11 60:14 paying 72:12 payment 26:8 27:10 37:6,11 37:18,23 38:5,6 38:7,12,23 40:10,11,17,17 45:7,25 46:3,6 46:7 48:25 49:1 49:2 51:10,14 51:16 56:22 57:7,11,14 58:7 58:18 59:1,2,3 59:15,24 60:3,6 60:22,25 61:18 62:19 64:13,15	68:20 72:16,18 75:1,5 76:16 85:13 89:10,14 92:20 93:22,24 93:25 99:13 110:25 111:7 112:1,5,7,9,11 112:15,16,21 113:4,11,15 115:15 126:9 126:21 129:19 129:24 135:1 payments 25:8 25:10,16,18,19 27:8,11,13 36:13,14,19,22 36:24 37:13 39:15,18 40:20 40:21 41:5,6,8 41:12,24 42:17 44:12,23 45:3 48:14 51:19 52:20 55:9 56:1 59:10 60:21 61:15,16 64:7 64:23 75:18,20 94:21 98:17,23 99:1,3,20 100:16 101:1 103:23 107:6 107:20,23,25 108:6,10 110:19,23 111:5,13,21,25 114:8,13 124:9 125:12,15,23 126:4,9,14 130:4,6,23 payroll 10:1 53:21 107:21 pays 48:4 81:9 82:4,10,19 PC 2:3 PE 97:12 penalty 135:23	people 51:19 71:22 72:3 95:10 103:18 people's 26:1 57:2 percent 15:25,25 23:14 28:5 30:10,11 33:13 36:8 68:18 69:4 69:5,11 74:18 74:22 92:3 102:19 106:18 perception 53:14 perform 126:21 performed 71:24 performing 9:25 period 23:16 93:5 104:2,11 104:21 116:14 120:1 137:15 perjury 135:23 person 7:19,20 7:21 9:17,18 39:9,10 44:21 72:25 77:3 80:25 81:10 101:10 115:14 137:8 personal 26:16 26:22,24 44:14 48:20 49:10 76:1 98:10 131:18,19 personally 25:13 25:17 64:19,20 64:22 108:21 personnel-wise 107:7 perspective 33:23 35:20 pertain 72:22 pertained 105:8 pertaining 93:20 97:10 pertains 79:22	petition 123:23 phrase 51:3 97:4 physical 85:5 physically 22:23 66:14 pick 45:20 48:25 109:20 piece 15:20,21 pin 8:6 place 33:20 35:2 66:13 137:8 Plaintiff 1:7 2:13 plan 14:22,23,25 17:11 plane 82:7 130:21 platform 10:20 12:10 play 15:6 64:15 please 4:5 5:5 14:5 30:22 66:18 68:7 83:21 95:20 114:1,22 115:14 118:6,7 118:10 127:2 129:12 pled 98:13 plenty 57:3 point 6:10,14 7:2 7:3,3,4 9:13 18:8 24:16 29:25 36:23 37:12 39:4 45:15 53:3 56:16 57:1 60:10,16 61:17 63:2 73:19 79:21 80:3,4,5 80:5,14 83:23 89:10 97:9 101:12 109:6 128:18 129:2 pointed 102:22 points 7:6 20:14
--	--	--	--	--

David Klos - October 27, 2021

policy 33:20 35:2 35:6	84:2,9,17	128:19	process 17:9 32:10 51:19	43:12
portion 16:4 21:12	prepared 26:7 53:18 54:9	primary 9:15 109:5	66:17 83:24,25	providing 12:24
portions 20:8	64:20 66:14	principal 37:5,9 37:13,16 38:9	109:8 121:3,4	provision 114:19 129:22,25
position 7:25 13:18 43:22	80:8	40:12 45:12	122:2	public 10:3
51:9 79:11,18	preparing 18:9 19:20 129:8,10	46:9,16,24 47:2	processing 10:1	purport 28:8
121:13,15	prepay 46:15,19 46:24 47:24,25	47:22 48:16	produced 1:18 83:14,16 117:6	purpose 23:8,12 85:25
possibility 79:23	48:5,7 49:19	49:8,24 123:11	production 117:14	purposes 30:21 31:21 32:22
possible 17:17 48:11 50:3 74:5	50:8	131:16	professional 4:18	36:3 73:8 75:22
89:23,25 90:19	prepaying 50:21 51:3	print 117:8	program 105:9	pursuant 12:22 13:14 74:15
91:17 95:1,8,9	prepayment 37:19,23 38:1	prior 14:22 19:18 24:19 27:9	progression 5:24	112:11
95:10	38:11,13 46:13	31:19 40:10	promissory 16:7 22:14 23:9	put 6:15 10:2 26:1 86:6 93:6
possibly 41:6	63:23 64:12	53:18 56:17	24:21 25:2	
potential 53:19 92:12 97:17	113:5,12,18	57:5,12,17,21	27:13 33:17	Q
potentially 30:14 96:8,14,16	114:11 129:16	69:17 87:14,15	38:15 39:4	qualification 64:4
power 89:9 90:21 90:23	129:18,23	88:15 92:4	46:12 50:19	qualitative 16:1
practice 30:1,5 34:4,14 35:18	130:5 131:2,9	97:14 98:12	52:18 63:4	question 9:1 11:18,25 13:1
50:4 69:23 70:3	131:14 132:1	104:11 112:14	65:10 66:6,10	14:13 16:8,22
73:6 78:7 79:4	133:12,20	112:15 113:5	66:13,20 67:12	16:25 17:2
86:5 90:7	134:7,20,25	113:10,18	70:21 85:2	20:24 21:25
109:11,12	135:5,7	122:22 123:23	97:11,16	22:9,16 23:11
practices 70:11	prepayments 27:2 38:10	126:7,12,18	122:19 130:3	24:25 25:4,6,12
pre 135:5	44:15,19,23	131:20 135:1	130:12,14	27:5 29:11 33:1
precision 28:5	45:1,5 63:4,21	priorities 89:11	131:18,19	33:25 34:15,22
predicate 41:22 42:2	64:8 134:12	privilege 132:6 133:2,4	133:12	35:14 36:5
preference 73:7 73:11 90:7	preposterous 89:15	probably 4:24 6:12 8:9 9:7	promoted 6:1	37:21 38:18,21
prefix 135:5	present 18:20,25 56:20 68:15	15:11,19 23:19	proper 108:10 132:11	39:1,8 40:4,15
premise 43:1,3 89:8	93:9	24:7 35:12	protest 126:18	40:19 42:2,25
prep 83:21	presented 66:14	39:11 44:7	provide 110:10 110:12	43:20 44:10,11
prepaid 49:22 131:18,19	president 43:10 43:11 121:17	73:24,24 83:9	provided 13:2,3 13:13 20:15,15	44:17,25 45:10
preparation 19:13 21:9 67:7	pretty 11:15 60:24	98:7 105:3,13	21:6 40:12	45:18 46:22
67:8 84:19	previously 53:6 125:3	108:7 114:19	76:13 80:6	47:3,9,16 48:9
prepare 54:6	pricing 10:16,16	problem 57:2	102:5 107:2,24	48:23 49:16,18
	primarily 6:7 26:22 88:5	problems 29:21	109:25 110:4	49:25 50:2,14
		procedure 33:20 35:2,6 39:5	110:16 122:4	51:6 52:22
		66:13 83:23,24	125:14 137:15	53:23 54:8 55:4
		proceedings 5:3 96:6 108:1	provider 11:12 71:24	55:13,20,22
		proceeds 80:22 81:6	providers 10:16	57:9,20 60:13 61:2,4 63:6

David Klos - October 27, 2021

64:1,10 65:20	96:3,7,18	31:19 34:23	records 110:24	97:16,16 99:20
66:1,8,16,21	raising 62:17	36:6 41:13 42:3	111:4	100:16 102:20
67:16,24 69:21	rate 84:15 86:2,6	56:5,9,12,14	recover 17:15	103:7 137:20
71:4,13,21	ratify 28:6	57:17,22 58:10	recoveries 17:10	relates 18:5
76:19 77:7,16	ratio 104:2,10	58:16,20 59:8	recovers 16:6	70:21
77:21 78:5,9,24	rational 80:25	62:16 63:18	reduced 137:10	relating 19:23
79:6,20 81:3,12	rationally 92:25	67:18 82:24	reduction 38:8	relationship
81:24 82:7,14	reached 104:11	85:7 86:19	45:12	53:15 133:21
83:15 87:4	read 20:8,10,20	87:20 88:21	refer 125:7	relevant 5:5
88:19,24 89:6,8	20:25 21:11,11	92:10 99:12	reference 52:18	relieve 45:14
90:15 91:4,10	44:22 46:25	102:10 106:21	referred 87:24	111:6 114:11
93:14 94:9,12	48:24 118:6	116:15 118:19	123:2	129:18,23
94:13,14,21	127:8,14,21	118:22 120:23	referring 87:17	130:3,5
95:6,7 96:5	128:6 130:1	121:16 122:21	98:22	relieved 112:15
97:24 99:5,24	131:14 132:23	123:6,16 124:2	reflected 37:14	relieves 131:2
100:1,20,21	reading 21:5	127:20 130:13	44:13 120:8	reloaned 76:4
101:4 102:1,16	46:6 131:8	receipt 26:1	reflects 103:21	remainder 49:24
103:16 104:19	reads 46:23	receive 74:18	refresh 54:13	remember 5:16
104:22 108:3	real 107:13	received 99:19	regarding 16:7	7:5 12:1,18
119:3 125:20	realize 128:6	100:15 103:19	18:24 100:16	13:9 14:24
125:20 128:14	realized 127:21	106:19	127:5	15:10 18:6
130:8,9,17	really 6:12 9:16	receiving 22:24	regardless 16:16	22:22,24,25
131:4,7,12,22	10:15 16:8 54:4	33:3	16:20 60:17	32:5 34:11,16
132:4,5,11,14	73:9 78:12	recognize 27:23	72:24	34:18 38:20
132:24,24	83:13 95:9	104:7	regular 66:12	39:24 42:8
133:6,14,17,23	101:11 105:4	recollection 5:25	88:16	50:25 51:24
134:9,13,16,18	107:5 108:19	8:3 28:20 29:17	regularly 31:9	52:1,10,13,23
134:20 135:3	109:2 128:19	40:7 50:18	129:19,24	53:13 56:8 57:5
questions 19:12	129:6	51:18 52:15,17	130:4,6	57:16,24,25
77:12 80:13	realtime 85:14	55:7,8 68:17	reimburse 70:24	58:3,19,22
95:17 97:25	reason 23:8	75:21 76:6	reimbursed	59:25 60:8,20
109:15 110:18	30:14 35:21	78:16,17 88:3,4	81:15	62:20,22,25
111:19 114:3	40:23,24 41:1	91:24 94:5	reimbursement	63:1,23 67:4
126:24 129:13	54:24 55:10	95:13 101:24	53:21 72:23	69:13 71:14
135:10,12	67:22,24 75:17	105:7 115:4	reinstate 60:7	74:5,6 78:17
quick 48:12	75:19 99:21	123:21 125:6	reinvestment	83:22 84:20
quite 7:9 31:9	100:18,21	126:2	105:9	85:4 86:15,17
quote 115:22	113:7,14	record 4:5 16:14	reiterate 17:13	87:11,23 88:2
	115:24	25:9 64:6 68:3	REITs 10:3	92:10,11,12
R	reasoning 105:2	105:24 106:2	reject 67:22,24	93:2,17 94:5,18
radar 93:6	reasons 23:20	117:12	89:7	94:19,22 97:18
radars 26:1	74:1 88:4	recorded 37:13	relate 19:22	97:19 98:19
raise 24:5,7	recall 4:23 19:2	37:14 38:7	related 70:20	101:15 105:4
119:3	21:4,5 22:22	recording 25:15	74:11 81:1	108:5 109:7
raised 24:3 80:15	23:6 24:3 27:13	39:14	92:18 96:3	110:21 113:13

David Klos - October 27, 2021

123:4,8 124:5 130:11 131:4,7 remembering 34:10 92:23 remind 99:6 rep 80:5 repaid 76:1 repay 89:3 repaying 93:25 repayment 76:7 repeat 22:10 27:6 100:3 rephrase 20:24 22:11 49:17 133:5 report 8:15 9:16 10:23 53:19 120:24 121:24 reported 1:23 reporter 117:8 135:13,16 137:1,3,15 represent 19:15 95:24 representation 19:17 represented 2:4 2:11,18 requested 137:13 137:14 reservation 91:25 respect 19:19 22:17 24:20 25:2,18 35:3 38:3 41:11 47:22 49:23 51:9 58:16 68:16 69:12 71:22,23 72:21 76:23 79:8 80:1 80:8 82:25 84:14,18 85:5 86:14 94:3,20 108:6 111:21	121:13 125:13 125:24 respectful 76:25 respond 25:7 60:15 response 128:16 responsibilities 7:15 8:7 9:22 108:16 responsibility 32:17,18 90:4,5 118:17 responsible 11:4 39:14 71:7 108:9,17,19 109:10,13,13 restate 61:10 resulted 71:25 retail 9:4 80:9 120:25 121:20 121:23 122:4 122:11 128:16 128:19 return 76:25 reverse 40:9 review 39:19 48:12 121:3 137:13 reviewed 84:10 ridiculousness 97:5 right 16:17,21 17:25 18:20 21:23 33:22 37:5 41:25 45:16 47:6 55:1 56:1 66:21 67:20 68:9 75:18 78:14 80:4 81:9 83:14 85:19 88:8,22 89:19 107:9 109:25 111:23 114:24 115:2 117:3,12	123:12 124:17 124:22,25 125:5 126:5 127:11,14,20 132:25 133:6 Rip 37:2 role 5:15 6:2,12 6:16,18,21 8:22 9:4,11 11:5 12:16 13:7,14 19:13 24:19 25:1,14,17,21 25:22,23 26:25 39:10 53:4,6 58:16 62:1 64:15,17 67:6 67:11 78:13 84:18,21 85:5,8 85:11 86:13,21 128:18 roll 23:15 rolled 125:3 rolling 88:15 rolls 39:18 64:18 roughly 6:9 round 39:20 81:18 RPR 1:23 Rukavina 2:5 3:3 3:6 4:4 9:10 11:21 12:3 13:5 14:16 17:23 18:4 20:19,23 20:25 21:6 22:3 22:11,19 23:17 25:8,16 27:7,17 27:18 29:16 33:5 34:6 35:1 35:24 36:11,21 38:2,20 39:2,20 40:9,18 41:19 41:22 43:4,23 44:20 45:6,14 45:23 47:3,10 47:17 48:13	49:9 50:1,5,17 51:8 53:11 54:3 54:11 55:6,16 55:24 56:14 57:12,21 60:19 61:5 63:10,14 64:14 65:23 66:4,11,19,25 67:1,18 68:4 70:1 71:10,18 72:6 76:24 77:8 78:1,9 79:2,9 80:18 81:8,21 82:2,8,17 83:16 83:19 86:1 87:8 88:21 89:17 91:1,7,13,20 92:7 94:3,11,14 94:17 95:7,14 110:18 111:9 111:20 112:3 112:10 113:19 116:20,25 117:7,11,15 119:9,16 120:4 120:9,15,21 125:16,19 126:25 127:2 128:22 130:11 130:19 131:8 131:17,24 132:6,9,13,17 132:20 133:1,4 133:8,18 134:1 134:14,24 135:8 rule 39:5 127:6 rush 135:19	49:19 61:11 90:9 92:23 94:6 94:22 109:9 says 18:2 46:13 46:14 48:5,14 68:7 80:12 115:23 118:7 118:18 127:17 129:17 131:2 134:11 scenario 33:6 schedule 28:1 37:15,25 38:12 45:3,7 scheduled 27:9 38:5 40:10 56:22 57:7 129:19,24 130:4,6 schedules 64:21 80:10 111:3 school 4:15 5:7 Schroth 26:10,12 108:15,17 Science 4:16 scratch 27:7 screen 117:22 screwed 111:17 se 37:25 38:13 second 28:8 37:4 67:25 72:15 73:2 103:25 Section 46:13 130:22 131:8 131:14 securities 10:20 11:14 see 21:18 22:2 28:11,15,16 46:1,17,18 48:17,18 49:2 58:14 83:7,12 113:9 114:5 117:20,24 125:21 129:22
---	--	--	---	---

David Klos - October 27, 2021

129:25 130:24 130:25 131:1 seeing 44:20 48:6 48:11 59:8 61:19 85:14 114:9 130:11 seen 50:17,22,23 83:9 114:18 126:18 Seery 15:8 18:13 19:8,9,11 20:3 53:15 56:15,19 57:13,15,18,23 60:5 96:25 97:3 97:21 98:2 129:9,11 Seery's 21:12,19 semiannual 14:22 send 42:23 68:7 sending 33:4,5,6 33:8 90:24 115:14 sends 80:2 senior 5:17 7:3 sense 50:4,5 73:20 104:4,5 108:20 113:22 113:25 134:22 135:4 sensitive 86:24 sent 36:16,18 54:15 59:17 69:4 76:5 83:1 83:2 115:1 sentence 46:14 48:13,21 50:8 50:16 sentences 127:25 separate 10:25 11:7 70:20 106:25 107:4 Separately 52:10 separating 79:23 Series 4:20	service 11:12 71:24 services 10:17 12:23,24 13:3,4 13:13,15 41:3 43:12 53:20 71:11,15,17 107:2,15,15,24 108:8 109:22 109:24 110:4,7 110:10,12,16 set 115:14 118:7 settlement 9:6 seven 75:14 123:23 seven-figure 113:23 shape 6:16 shared 12:22 13:14 41:2 43:12 53:20 54:18 109:22 110:7 sheet 120:13,20 sheets 80:6,8 shocked 73:22 short 6:12 short-term 86:7 shorthand 1:24 137:2,7,25 shortly 116:11 show 28:8 117:5 showing 44:4 45:20 53:19 76:20 shows 45:25 side 85:11 96:15 sides 43:2 sign 85:1 signatures 22:24 86:18 signed 84:22 significance 128:11 significant 12:2	12:10 45:21 signing 86:14 signs 80:5 similar 8:7 13:4 13:16 74:9 82:24 107:12 107:19 single 23:15 29:21 32:17 34:12 36:8 62:14 123:22 sir 4:4 17:18 18:4 28:11,15 33:10 46:17 48:17 67:2,19 76:14 81:8 83:20 89:18 127:5 129:15,17 130:2 132:14 133:5,9 sister 97:9 sit 89:11 sitting 16:3,24 17:3,14 42:14 44:20 63:24 96:11 102:18 103:6 104:15 131:24 133:10 133:19 situation 31:22 69:23 93:1 situations 31:23 32:3 34:5 smart 17:18 50:7 SMU 4:15,17 solvency 87:6 solvent 87:2,5 somebody 35:19 somewhat 128:20 soon 118:10 132:21 sophisticated 44:21 sorry 9:20 22:19 24:22 41:21	45:24 47:20 55:21 57:19 58:25 63:16 76:16 78:14 88:22 99:8 108:11 129:14 129:20 sort 53:6 97:8 102:23 sought 87:25 sounds 50:10 80:21 81:19 82:17 source 64:6 speak 81:13 speaking 30:4 40:16 77:22 108:18 speaks 50:15 specific 8:6 14:4 28:20 31:22 34:11 38:3 42:15,18 50:25 51:1 52:23 58:4 68:17 91:24 95:13 103:14 112:23 123:17 129:25 specifically 4:23 15:10 34:24 39:10 42:8 51:24 52:13 56:7,12 62:13 67:20 69:14 71:14 74:6 81:13 83:11 86:4 87:11,24 92:13 93:8 94:22 98:21 112:20 115:10 118:16 specificity 34:24 36:7 42:11 53:13 82:16 96:14 102:24	105:14 specifics 14:24 93:18 specify 93:7 speculate 15:4 29:2 32:11 73:25 speculating 28:25 41:11 44:3 speculation 29:1 29:3,6 83:6 113:19 speed 106:24 spelled 37:24 split 108:16 spoke 18:10,19 101:6,9 spoken 18:13,15 spreadsheet 54:14 stake 18:1 stamp 117:17 standard 84:4,6 86:9,9 standpoint 92:18 135:6 STANG 2:10 start 27:7 47:17 95:19 111:17 started 5:7 10:5 101:17 108:23 starting 5:6 state 1:23 4:4,19 51:12 114:10 138:1 stated 137:9 statement 26:7 119:14 statements 36:17 116:14,18,24 119:8,19,22 120:1 STATES 1:1 step 32:9 68:25
--	--	--	---	--

Dickman Davenport, Inc

214.855.5100

www.dickmandavenport.com

800.445.9548

Appx. 03233

David Klos - October 27, 2021

134:5,5 Stinson 2:17 95:23 stood 87:11 Stoops 7:23 stop 21:10 65:9 94:15 100:13 street 1:25 2:4 10:17 82:3 strike 23:6 32:19 33:15 37:10 52:16 54:22 63:25 67:4 120:15 125:16 string 118:4 127:5 strong 73:11 92:17 structure 14:8 30:6 struggle 64:11 128:15 131:13 struggling 45:2 50:6,7 88:25 99:25 subject 108:10 Subscribed 135:24 subsequent 96:4 96:7,23 102:9 102:12 103:2 116:17 119:10 119:13 120:1,7 substance 19:1 98:6,9 substantially 16:2 substantive 97:1 sue 82:11 suggested 55:1 suggesting 62:22 128:9 Suite 2:4,17 138:2 sum 113:24	summary 21:7 supervision 137:11 support 87:20 supporting 12:9 72:3 suppose 31:18 50:3 85:11 95:10 sure 5:7 6:2 19:4 20:1 26:6 27:21 31:23 37:22 44:7,8 47:19 49:18 51:13 55:21 58:8 61:11,25 64:3,3 65:11,14 66:19 74:24 85:12 95:12 97:24 99:10 100:22 103:6 106:15 125:9 127:4 128:25 129:1 135:15 surely 128:22 129:3 surprised 130:14 suspect 55:10 68:14 123:19 suspend 111:14 switch 65:8 sworn 1:19 4:2 137:4 <hr/> T <hr/> take 12:22 14:5 16:8 18:9 23:12 68:24 71:16 117:21 118:17 taken 1:20 87:14 137:7 takes 16:5 17:5,9 talk 12:14 18:12 21:21 54:3 98:15 122:14	talked 19:15,24 69:13 94:4 103:3 talking 27:12 32:16,20 54:1 88:15 98:19 102:13 103:2 117:16 121:5 122:6 127:6 talks 129:16 130:22 tax 73:7 107:6,6 107:19 team 6:5,15 10:5 11:3 25:14,22 32:13,16,19 35:16 43:6,9 57:1 60:16 61:14 62:6,14 62:15 64:17 73:20 84:2 85:9 85:17 101:11 108:9 109:7 115:8,11,12,13 technical 78:6 technically 4:20 36:23 37:12 teeing 26:6 tell 7:11 14:18 24:22 28:4 34:2 34:7 36:25 44:2 52:7 53:11 55:17 56:3 58:23 59:5,14 69:16 71:16 83:17 93:4 103:6 105:13 106:10 112:13 112:25 113:2 115:20 116:2,6 116:22 119:12 120:6,18 122:9 126:7,12 137:4 telling 56:14 58:14 68:15	tells 43:18 55:25 94:23 temporarily 76:12 tend 109:1 term 7:16 8:1 9:3 24:10 45:1 47:21 86:3 88:15 98:17 104:1,2,5,7,8 107:25 108:1 124:10,11,13 125:7,13,25 126:10,13 134:21,21 terminology 98:14 terms 6:19 9:23 10:11 18:13,15 19:23 22:20 26:6 35:16 43:14 61:4 92:11 93:4 107:14,19 testified 4:2 41:23 99:18 100:14 124:2 testify 16:15,19 testimony 35:24 62:9 79:12 98:16 100:22 100:23 137:9 Texas 1:2,23,25 4:19 81:22 82:1 82:9,16,21 135:25 138:1 thank 95:14 96:1 109:16,17 124:19 135:8 thanks 100:12 Thedford 23:2 thereto 137:21 thing 33:22 53:6 59:18 84:13 things 10:1 25:25	57:3 79:14 122:5 think 6:9 7:2 15:18 16:3 18:18 26:14 30:15 31:6,8,22 32:9 36:16,19 39:21 41:1,10 50:15 53:2 58:12,22 59:4 59:11 64:6 65:6 65:7,8 75:2,13 78:6 79:16 80:24 84:15 85:23 86:10,15 87:21 88:13 95:9 97:19 99:14 101:5,9 103:11 105:3 105:25 106:17 107:9,22 108:4 108:6 111:17 113:7,14,24 123:24 thinking 57:4 117:11 129:7 Third 2:10 73:6 third-party 10:16 11:12 thousand 92:6 threatened 5:2 three 5:9 6:12 97:12 102:11 124:10,11,13 124:24 125:2 throw 104:1 Thursday 19:14 Tim 106:17 time 4:24 5:15 6:21,23 7:9,11 7:12,15 8:10,14 8:24 10:2,4 12:6,10 16:14 24:6,8 25:1 28:21 29:25
--	---	---	---	---

David Klos - October 27, 2021

36:23 37:12,18 39:11 41:4,12 42:5,12 43:22 43:22 44:19 47:13 49:4 52:14 53:2,8,14 53:15 54:21 56:16 59:23 60:2,10 62:5 63:2 65:12 66:11 74:10,20 79:4 80:15 83:23 84:12 86:23 89:10,16 92:10 93:5 95:12 101:13 108:24,25 109:6,16 111:12 112:14 113:17 116:2 122:18 123:18 129:2,7 134:12 135:1 137:8 timely 44:9 51:15 51:17 times 7:5 32:15 61:20 63:8 76:19 92:6 timing 15:24 title 5:15,16 6:22 7:1 10:9,11 12:16 13:7 26:14 titles 10:11 78:18 today 5:21 14:3 15:12 16:3,13 16:16,19,24 17:3,14 20:5 42:14 44:20 57:5 63:25 65:6 95:25 96:11 102:18 103:6 104:15 131:24 133:11,19 today's 47:6	told 39:21 42:14 43:4 52:11,11 52:19 53:12 55:9 60:21 61:23 62:13,14 62:15 68:12 69:9 70:9 85:19 91:8 95:1 97:25 98:2 100:25 103:7 118:16 118:23 122:11 122:23 tomorrow 79:11 132:22 top 107:9 127:7 topic 96:2 98:3 topics 20:11 103:25 106:23 total 116:15 totaling 119:24 touched 98:16 track 111:2 129:1 tracker 118:10 tracking 39:15 transaction 34:13 70:21 76:9 115:21 116:7 118:24 transcript 135:14 135:17 137:13 transfer 29:9 30:2 31:8,20 32:8 34:19 36:1 40:22 41:16 69:2,10 76:15 77:4,18 85:16 90:12 91:22,23 92:9 93:3 115:8 transferred 30:20 75:24 77:10 78:18 79:13 transferring 34:8 35:11 39:22 42:4 75:9	transfers 28:9,18 28:19,22 30:24 32:22 35:4,10 38:3 42:9 94:7 transitioned 109:1,6 transparent 115:17 Treasurer 121:11 treasury 9:6 107:6 treated 35:5 trigger 104:2,10 104:21 triggered 104:11 104:17 triggers 14:25 107:17 trouble 62:19 true 29:6 88:9 135:24 trust 15:16 17:10 17:15 18:6 trusts 26:16 65:23 108:21 truth 137:5,5,5 truthful 100:22 truthfully 16:16 16:19 try 62:23 106:24 trying 17:18 27:21 30:23 50:6 67:14 98:3 100:11 104:22 130:20 132:9 133:8 turn 114:15 123:25 turned 76:4 81:15 two 9:7 15:12 29:14 36:20 45:13 65:10 66:20 77:12	83:8 85:1 86:12 87:24 94:19 95:10 105:4,25 106:24 107:24 119:24 121:18 122:12 127:25 129:4 134:22 two-paragraph 84:12 TX 2:4,18 138:2 type 98:12 types 13:4 78:13 84:1 107:12,15 107:17 114:20 typewriting 137:10 typical 84:7 <hr/> U Uh-huh 7:18 13:23 47:7 75:11 127:9 ultimate 16:12 17:8,10 ultimately 11:4 39:19 64:18 73:9 um 63:13 unable 89:3,14 undergrad 4:15 Undergraduate 4:14 understand 14:14 15:19 17:14 18:19 30:23 47:4 51:8 61:11 62:8 66:4 67:25 68:2 88:25 96:17 97:24 98:8 106:3 118:12 118:15 124:14 132:1 understanding 19:11 20:11,13	37:17 48:19 49:18 51:12,14 54:17,22,23 56:21 61:12,22 70:18 72:7,10 75:7 79:4 87:1 87:9 91:11 97:6 98:23 101:12 101:18,19 102:2 112:19 121:9 124:3,15 133:11,20,25 134:2,6 understood 52:2 63:12 95:4 102:25 unfair 34:17 unfamiliar 80:21 UNITED 1:1 unpaid 46:15,24 47:2,20 48:15 48:15 49:4 131:15,16 unscheduled 38:23 64:7,23 75:18,20 upcoming 25:25 updated 54:15 upfront 85:11 use 14:19 56:25 70:23 81:17 108:20 usually 31:15 33:16 utilized 71:17 <hr/> V valid 39:3 valuation 5:17,19 5:24 6:2,15 9:14 10:7,9,14 10:15,24 11:3,7 11:12 71:11,15 71:17,25 72:1 72:13,14,21
---	---	---	---	---

David Klos - October 27, 2021

107:6 valuations 11:4 value 11:14 71:16 valuing 10:19 variety 107:16 various 25:23 79:14 vary 17:12 verbatim 94:17 verbiage 132:25 verify 27:24 versus 87:12 videoconference 1:19 2:6,13,19 videotape 21:18 view 131:10 virtually 44:5 vis-a-vis 15:16 voluntary 37:24 vs 1:8	Waterhouse 8:17 11:1 13:25 20:9 30:13,14,19 39:25 41:14 42:3,7 43:24 52:7,11,18,24 53:11 54:15,19 54:25 55:17,25 60:20 61:23 62:9 65:3 69:9 77:17 78:2,20 84:23 85:1,19 86:14 91:8 94:6 100:25 103:3 103:13 115:5 115:25 116:2 116:22 118:19 118:23 121:6 122:9 124:4,8 125:11,22 126:15 127:13 127:16 Waterhouse's 21:1,19 127:10 waters 43:14 way 6:16 20:12 22:22 31:15 34:3 35:17,22 48:24 54:1 63:8 69:6 72:15,17 76:10 82:19 87:18 92:1,1,1 92:2 93:24 94:6 95:3 97:5 102:23 114:10 121:5 137:19 ways 38:21 we'll 20:1 54:3 125:7 132:17 132:21 we're 12:8 27:12 32:15 43:11,12 64:1 65:8,9,10 65:12 79:22 80:4 117:17,18	121:5 122:6 we've 19:24 75:13 78:12 wearing 43:15 week 36:20 83:7 weekly 25:24 43:5,24 63:19 129:8,10 weeks 59:5 welcome 117:19 127:7 went 4:14 58:17 81:17 85:14 101:18 weren't 61:21 80:16 88:7 97:15 101:20 whatsoever 63:20 wherewithal 93:24 wind 16:5 17:5 winding 15:2,22 wire 59:17 61:19 118:7 withdrawn 91:19 110:11 111:15 113:1,7,8 124:10,12 within-entitled 137:6 witness 1:19 9:2 11:19 12:1 13:2 14:14 19:12 21:4 22:1,10,17 23:12 25:5,13 27:6 29:12 33:2 34:1,23 35:15 36:6 37:22 38:19 39:9 40:5 40:16 41:18,21 43:1,21 44:18 45:1,11,19 46:23 48:10,24 49:17 50:3,15	51:7 52:23 53:25 54:9 55:5 55:14,21 56:12 57:10 60:14 61:3 63:7 64:11 65:21 66:2,9,17 69:22 71:5,14 71:22 76:21 77:22 78:6,25 79:7,21 81:4,13 81:25 82:15 83:15 85:22 87:5 88:20 89:7 90:16 91:5,11 93:15 94:10 95:15 99:6,25 100:7,13,21 101:5 102:2,17 103:17 104:20 108:4 109:17 111:10 112:5 112:11 113:21 117:1 119:10 119:17 120:10 120:22 128:15 130:9,18 131:7 131:13,23 133:16,24 134:10,19 135:4,9 137:3 137:10 word 56:25 133:11,20 words 10:24 36:7 52:16,24 94:19 work 5:5 10:19 worked 5:8 11:22 62:4 working 5:7,11 12:5 world 108:23 116:3,7 118:22 119:2,12 120:6 120:18 worth 34:10	worthiness 90:11 wouldn't 25:13 38:10 43:8 56:22,23 60:16 64:8,20 77:24 86:24 87:17 99:15 write 128:3,5 writes 127:13 writing 103:21 103:24 113:9 125:22 126:18 written 35:2,6 66:6 wrong 55:1 82:18 82:22 88:22 89:19 wrote 67:21 70:12 www.dickman... 138:4
W				X
want 16:24 44:10 54:4 63:8 90:6 95:18 96:19 98:15 100:10 101:14 104:1 117:9 134:19 135:13,16 wanted 24:17 34:3 96:2 wants 90:16,20 90:22 wasn't 23:24 24:1 31:20 37:18 38:5 50:4 51:11,15,16 53:4 57:1,3 59:20 60:15 62:6 70:17 72:19 73:3,3 75:2 101:11 103:17 108:12 129:10				Y
				y'all 95:2 Yang 106:15 yeah 6:23 8:2 14:21 15:23 19:17 23:2 29:12,20 35:15 37:22 43:1 55:14 56:24 59:2 60:14 61:3 63:7,8,12,18 66:17 67:9 71:5 83:24 89:7 91:11 94:10 96:10 98:20 99:25 101:5 102:2 124:15 125:1 135:19 year 6:1 9:25 29:22 49:21 111:1,8,12,13

David Klos - October 27, 2021

113:4 123:17 126:5,15,22 years 5:9 6:17 15:12 24:10,17 30:18 32:21 33:20 34:17 39:14 48:7 65:17 66:3 69:18 94:20 95:3,11 123:23 years' 34:10 yes-or-no 94:12 York 2:11 132:21	46:12 49:10 114:1 129:12 129:14 13-week 126:3 14 27:15,17,23 36:12 40:20 42:17 44:13,22 48:12 49:1 58:25 59:23 60:2,23 61:18 64:2,5 15 61:7 15(c) 80:9 121:4 127:6 128:17 16 8:9 31:18 127:2 17 8:10 18 8:10 19 8:24 45:24 49:2 1982 4:10	200 12:6 2009 5:12,15 6:3 6:3 29:24,25 122:17 2010 6:9 106:13 123:18 2011 6:10,21 106:13 123:18 2012 123:18 2017 6:22 22:13 23:7 24:8,18 88:22 105:12 124:25 2018 116:14 119:14 120:2 2019 8:11,14 9:10 9:13 10:6 11:10 11:16,21 27:14 28:9 29:8,17,21 29:25 31:18 35:8 36:15,22 40:21 41:1,13 42:8,16,16 44:13,13 45:23 45:24 65:13,15 66:11 75:14 78:20 80:6,19 87:2,9,13 88:9 88:14 89:2,17 91:21 92:8 93:2 93:11 105:13 110:20 111:6 111:12,21 112:2,6,8 114:23 115:9 121:7 2020 7:13,22 24:20,24 51:10 51:15,22 53:18 54:24 56:17,22 57:6,13,17,22 60:20 61:21 63:19 98:18,24 99:19 100:15 101:2 102:14	102:17,17 103:23 112:17 113:2,4,12 120:24 121:7 121:21 124:1,9 125:12,24 126:10 127:11 128:23 129:3 2021 1:15,21 13:24 58:25 59:23 60:2 61:8 87:16 88:1 112:22,25 113:3,10,16 126:8,13 128:2 129:4 136:1 137:22 21-03004-sgj 1:8 214 138:3 23-point 45:20 23.034- 45:21 24.7- 46:10 27 1:15,21 4:20 29 37:6	51:10,15 56:17 56:22 57:6,13 57:17,21 58:7,9 60:25 87:15 88:1 98:18,24 120:2 124:25 3102 2:17 312 138:1 338- 37:8 34th 2:11 3763 83:15 3800 2:4 38th 1:25 398,000 85:23
Z zero 46:8 49:6 80:1 ZIEHL 2:10	16 8:9 31:18 127:2 17 8:10 18 8:10 19 8:24 45:24 49:2 1982 4:10	2018 116:14 119:14 120:2 2019 8:11,14 9:10 9:13 10:6 11:10 11:16,21 27:14 28:9 29:8,17,21 29:25 31:18 35:8 36:15,22 40:21 41:1,13 42:8,16,16 44:13,13 45:23 45:24 65:13,15 66:11 75:14 78:20 80:6,19 87:2,9,13 88:9 88:14 89:2,17 91:21 92:8 93:2 93:11 105:13 110:20 111:6 111:12,21 112:2,6,8 114:23 115:9 121:7 2020 7:13,22 24:20,24 51:10 51:15,22 53:18 54:24 56:17,22 57:6,13,17,22 60:20 61:21 63:19 98:18,24 99:19 100:15 101:2 102:14	21-03004-sgj 1:8 214 138:3 23-point 45:20 23.034- 45:21 24.7- 46:10 27 1:15,21 4:20 29 37:6	4 4 3:3 45:23 91:21 4.4 118:9 4.4- 76:4 411,000 37:8 4228 138:2 445-9548 138:3
0 0 36:8 69:4 08 4:24 09 4:24	2 2 66:24 67:2,7 73:25 76:3 80:4 85:23 87:9,13 92:8 114:23 115:9 2.03- 46:9 2.1 28:14 45:25 46:3 49:1,8 130:22 131:8 2.1- 46:5,7 2.4 68:7 69:2 70:7,19,23 72:7 73:18 75:22 76:3 77:10,18 78:9 85:18,20 91:22 92:8,15 115:8 116:3,23 2.4- 70:21 73:23 77:4 85:24 86:13 90:6 2:30 1:22 20 8:24 24:17	2018 116:14 119:14 120:2 2019 8:11,14 9:10 9:13 10:6 11:10 11:16,21 27:14 28:9 29:8,17,21 29:25 31:18 35:8 36:15,22 40:21 41:1,13 42:8,16,16 44:13,13 45:23 45:24 65:13,15 66:11 75:14 78:20 80:6,19 87:2,9,13 88:9 88:14 89:2,17 91:21 92:8 93:2 93:11 105:13 110:20 111:6 111:12,21 112:2,6,8 114:23 115:9 121:7 2020 7:13,22 24:20,24 51:10 51:15,22 53:18 54:24 56:17,22 57:6,13,17,22 60:20 61:21 63:19 98:18,24 99:19 100:15 101:2 102:14	21-03004-sgj 1:8 214 138:3 23-point 45:20 23.034- 45:21 24.7- 46:10 27 1:15,21 4:20 29 37:6	5 5 74:7,8,24 75:4 75:23 77:4,11 77:18 78:3 79:22 80:2 81:18 82:25 85:4 86:13 91:22 93:3 114:16 118:8 118:13,24 119:7,14 5- 76:5 90:1 5,019,000 75:3 5.2 80:19 5:00 95:19 5:14 1:22 135:21 500 1:24 2:3 500,000 123:9,12
1 1 8:11 24:20,23 66:24 67:2,7 80:3 113:10 126:8,12 137:22 1-31-23 138:4 1-4 27:17 1-6 127:3 1.3 28:13,14 1.4 58:25 10 19:6 32:21 33:20 34:10,17 69:18 95:3 123:19 100 15:25 10017-2024 2:11 101 138:2 109 3:5 11 123:19 127 3:6 13 23:8 27:9	2 2 66:24 67:2,7 73:25 76:3 80:4 85:23 87:9,13 92:8 114:23 115:9 2.03- 46:9 2.1 28:14 45:25 46:3 49:1,8 130:22 131:8 2.1- 46:5,7 2.4 68:7 69:2 70:7,19,23 72:7 73:18 75:22 76:3 77:10,18 78:9 85:18,20 91:22 92:8,15 115:8 116:3,23 2.4- 70:21 73:23 77:4 85:24 86:13 90:6 2:30 1:22 20 8:24 24:17	2018 116:14 119:14 120:2 2019 8:11,14 9:10 9:13 10:6 11:10 11:16,21 27:14 28:9 29:8,17,21 29:25 31:18 35:8 36:15,22 40:21 41:1,13 42:8,16,16 44:13,13 45:23 45:24 65:13,15 66:11 75:14 78:20 80:6,19 87:2,9,13 88:9 88:14 89:2,17 91:21 92:8 93:2 93:11 105:13 110:20 111:6 111:12,21 112:2,6,8 114:23 115:9 121:7 2020 7:13,22 24:20,24 51:10 51:15,22 53:18 54:24 56:17,22 57:6,13,17,22 60:20 61:21 63:19 98:18,24 99:19 100:15 101:2 102:14	21-03004-sgj 1:8 214 138:3 23-point 45:20 23.034- 45:21 24.7- 46:10 27 1:15,21 4:20 29 37:6	6 6 4:10 127:11 128:22 129:3 6/30 122:2

Dickman Davenport, Inc

214.855.5100

www.dickmandavenport.com

800.445.9548

Appx. 03237

David Klos - October 27, 2021

600,000 76:6,7
630,000 28:14
66,000 46:7 49:4
 49:5,7

7

7 58:11,15
7.4 75:9 78:22
 79:12 89:2
 90:17,20,22,24
 119:25 122:5
7.4 89:19 91:13
75 18:1
750,000 28:13
 37:6
75201 2:4
75206 138:2
75219 2:18
777 2:17
780 2:10

8

80 15:25
800 138:3
855-5100 138:3

9

9 19:5
95 3:4